DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 941 TE 002 207

AUTHOR	Holland, Thomas R., Ed; Lee, Catherine M., Ed.
TITLE	"The Alternative of Radicalism": Radical and Conservative Possibilities for Teaching the Teachers of America's Young Children: Proceedings of the National Conference of the Tri-University Project (5th, New Orleans, January 29-31, 1969).
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Tri-University Project in Elementary Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 69
NOTE	194p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, Andrews Hall, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 ($1.50). Make checks payable to the Univ. of Nebraska.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education, Community Influence, *Economic Factors, *Educational Development, Educational Policy, Elementary Education, *English Education, *Equal Education, Humanism, Individualized Programs, Inner City, *Job Training, Mexican Americans, Racial Differences, Racial Integration, Racism, Secondary Education, Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report of the Fifth National Conference of the Tri-University Project is introduced by Paul Olson and contains speeches by (1) Virgil E. Boyd, who presents Chrysler Corporation's job-oriented educational program, (2) Don Davies, who calls for the equilization, individualization, and humanization of education, (3) Donald H. Smith, who explains the educational significance of the "street"--its culture, influence, and importance--in the lives of inner-city children, (4) Jerome S. Bruner, who discusses the "divisive dichotomies" present in education--e.g., old versus young, society versus individual, and order versus innovation, (5) Kenneth Boulding, who relates the economic process to education, and (6) Wayne Booth, who challenges the profession to educate Americans to be critical thinkers. Materials include responses to the six speeches, and the reports and transcriptions of committee discussions on such topics as community control, inner-city education, bilingual education in literature and composition, implementation of new ideas and programs, and three of education's specific regional problems, (the Mexican-American in the Southwest, integration in the South, and conservatism in Appalachia). (JM)

ED0 46941

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

. . . "THE ALTERNATIVE OF RADICALISM" . . .

Radical and Conservative Possibilities for Teaching the Teachers of America's Young Children

Editors
Thomas R. Holland
and
Catherine M. Lee

The U. S. Office of Education Tri-University Project
in Elementary Education
January 29-31, 1969
New Orleans, Louisiana

TE 002 207

...we shall have to adopt the alternative of radicalism -- of abrupt change, of confrontation with entrenched practice, of disestablishment, of challenge to centralized authority, of emotionally painful reappraisal of the functions and role of culture.

Jerome S. Bruner

Admittedly, our instructors and counselors have a distinct advantage. They can make their own rules and policies as experience dictates.... I am not at all suggesting that my industry, or the total business community, has become in a year's time the epitome of racial harmony and Christian attitudes.... But there is activity, there is learning, and there is progress.

Virgil E. Boyd

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction, Paul A. Olson 1

I

SPEECHES AND RESPONSES

Industry 7
  A Child's First Education and American Industry's
    New Entrance Into Education
      Virgil E. Boyd 8

The Office of Education 15
  Beyond a Sense of Outrage
      Don Davies 16

The American Community 23
  The Street is the Community School
      Donald H. Smith 24

  Response to Donald H. Smith
      Monsignor Robert Fox 36

The Child Himself 47
  Notes on Divisive Dichotomies
      Jerome S. Bruner 48

  Response to Jerome S. Bruner
      Fanny Shaftel 62

The Economic System and the School System 71
  Education and the Economic Process
      Kenneth Boulding 72

The University System and Schools for Children 83
  The Education of Uncritical Americans
      Wayne Booth 84

  Response to Wayne Booth
      Arthur Pearl 100

A Response to Arthur Pearl and Kenneth Boulding
      Ronald L. Cramer 109

II

REPORTS AND TRANSCRIPTIONS OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS

I. Community Control and the Power of Teachers 119
    A. The Poor Cow -- The Teacher as Forgotten Man in Contemporary Educational Reform
        Lawrence York 120
    B. Our Inability to See the Real
        Lupe Castillo 124
    C. Community Control and the TTT: A Correction
        Charles R. Bruning 128

II. Teachers and Education in an Oppressed Community: Spanish People in California 131
    A. Group Discussion 134
    B. Further Comment on the Spanish Discussion
        Leonore Bravo 151
    C. Reply to Leonore Bravo
        Paul A. Olson 155

III. Teachers and Education in a Conservative Region: Appalachia 157
    A. Group Discussion 160
    B. Report of Committee XXXIV
        Harry V. Scott 172

IV. Teachers and Education in a Traditionally Legally Segregated Society: The South 175
    A. Report of Committee XLIII
        Eveleen Lorton 178
    B. Report of Committees XXXVIII - XXXIX
        Earl Rand 179

V. Teachers, Educators and Education in the West 183
    A. Committee XXXV
        R. W. Lid 186
    B. Committee L
        James L. Hills 189

VI. The City and the Education of Teachers 193
    A. Committee XLVI: The Urban North
        Juanita Fletcher 196
    B. Note on Action
        Sister Mary Constantine 198

VII. The Mother Tongue and the Education of the Teacher . 199
A. Report of Committee IV: Literature
Gil Gravelle 202
B. Report of Committee I: Literature
William Anderson 204
C. Creating a Composition
Geoffrey Summerfield 208

VIII. Schools Where Teachers Can Be Educated 217
The Clinical School, Committee XXV 220

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

I. Community Representatives:
- Representative Ernest Morial, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Mr. John Dick, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Navajo Reservation
- Mrs. Alice Neundorf, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona
- Mr. Robert Norris, Fort Wingate Elementary School (New Mexico), Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- Mr. Jerry Brown, (Substitute for Mr. Jim Drake, Administrative Assistant to Mr. Cesar Chavez), Farm Workers Organizing Committee, Delano, California.
- Mr. Anthony Gibbs, Jr., Director, Woodlawn Education Experiment, The Woodlawn Organization, Chicago.
- Mrs. Louise Bufford, Chicago.
- Professor Armin Beck, Director, Center for Inner City Studies, Northeastern Illinois State College.
- Miss Sue Easterling, Kentucky.
- Mrs. Zi Graves, Kentucky.
- Mr. Ernest Chambers, Omaha, Nebraska.
- Mr. Daniel M. Goodwin, Omaha, Nebraska.

II. Office of Education Representatives:
- Dr. Dan Bernd, Chief, TTT Branch.
- Dr. Donald Bigelow, Director, Division of Program Administration.
- Dr. Don Davies, Associate Commissioner of Education.
- Dr. Bruce Gaarder, Branch Chief, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

III. University of Washington College Participants:
- Professor James D. Casteel, University of Florida.
- Professor Dano M. Faires, West Georgia College.
- Professor Owen A. Hagen, Saint Cloud State College.
- Professor Peter J. Hovenier, Southern Oregon College.
- Professor Bernard Kravitz, California State College at Fullerton.
- Professor Fred A. Lampe, Central Missouri State College.
- Professor Albert L. Nelson, Kansas Wesleyan University.
- Professor Wes Measel, Arizona State University.
- Professor Kenneth R. Parsons, Western State College of Colorado.
- Professor Oscar Allen Rogers, Jr., Jackson State College.
- Professor Lisso R. Simmons, Northwestern State College of Louisiana.
- Professor Dorothy J. Skeel, Indiana University.

University of Washington Elementary Teacher Participants:
- Mr. Gary M. Cummings, Bellevue, Washington.
- Mr. Joseph G. Decaroli, Brookfield, Illinois.
- Miss Sylvia L. Genovese, Rocky River, Ohio.
- Miss Lynn R. Hoff, Bellevue, Washington.
- Mr. Keith E. Kirby, Denver, Colorado.
- Miss Mary Lou L. Krusic, Issaquah, Washington.
- Mr. Phillip R. Martinez, Gallup, New Mexico.
- Miss Carol J. Price, Aptos, California.
- Mr. Orval C. Schaefer, Jr., Kent, Washington.
- Miss Diane J. Soroka, New York, New York.
- Mr. Steve T. Stansberry, Alderwool, Washington.
- Miss Harriet M. Trowbridge, Mercer Island, Washington.

IV. New York University College Participants:
- Mrs. Joan Allen, University of Houston.
- Dr. Aldon Bebb, Kansas State College.
- Mr. Rodney M. Borstad, University of Illinois.
- Mr. Raymond D. Bridges, State University College.
- Professor Gladys Collins, Virginia State College.
- Miss Eveleen Lorton, University of Miami.
- Mr. John Lorton, University of Southern Mississippi.
- Miss Grace A. Lund, University of Wisconsin.
- Professor Joy Manson, Utah State University.
- Rev. Bernard Meiring, St. Josephs College.
- Professor Howard Munson, Winona State College.
- Mr. Calvin F. White, Alcorn College.

New York University Elementary Teacher Participants:
- Mr. Clyde D. Budd, Jr., El Dorado Springs, Missouri.
- Mr. Larry J. Jacobsen, Logan, Utah.
- Mr. Lyle Hurd, Snowville, Utah.
- Miss Charlotte Kinnear, Houston, Texas.
- Miss Patricia Layne, Montclair, New Jersey.
- Sister Donna Liette, Kansas City, Missouri.
- Miss Gwendolynn McDonald, Houston, Texas.
- Miss Carol Pidde, Utica, New York.
- Miss Carol Thomas, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- Miss Georgiann Tofolo, Utica, New York.
- Mr. David Williams, Logan, Utah.

University of Nebraska College Participants:
- Mr. Paul C. Burns, University of Tennessee.
- Miss Loretta M. Butler, Xavier University.
- Mr. Ronald L. Cramer, Oakland University.
- Mr. John Fisher, Chico State College.
- Miss Eloise Hayes, University of Hawaii.

Miss Beverly L. Lusty, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.
Miss Sophia P. Nelson, West Virginia State College.
Mr. Earl W. Rand, Texas Southern University.
Miss Taimi M. Ranta, Illinois State University.
Mr. Curt M. Rulon, North Texas State University.
Sister Mary Constantine, Loyola University.
Mr. DeWayne R. Triplett, Northern Illinois University.

University of Nebraska Elementary Teacher Participants:
Mr. Larry D. Baker, Pullman, Washington.
Mr. James R. Creel, Dearborn, Michigan.
Mr. Gerald A. Darling, Live Oak, California.
Mrs. Mary Ann Krueger, Columbus, Nebraska.
Mr. Ronald Lundeberg, San Francisco, California.
Mrs. Christine A. Phillips, Omaha, Nebraska.
Miss Dazetta M. Spottsville, Colfax, Louisiana.
Mrs. Dixie A. Tice, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Mr. Lorenzo A. Ulibarri, Raton, New Mexico.
Mr. David H. Unruh, Newark, Delaware.
Mrs. Ruth K. Vaughan, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Miss Elizabeth J. Wolfram, Rochester, Minnesota.

VI. University of Washington Staff:
Phillip Bacon
John Jarolimek
Theodore Kaltsounis·
Howard Kardatske
Ambrose Clegg
Rosemarie McCartin
Anna Ochoa
Gary Manson
Elmer Williams
Arthur Nichols
Bernard Hansen
Gerald Newton
Thomas J. Pressly

New York University Staff:
Margot Ely
Edward Henderson
June McLeod
George Manolakes
Nancy Modiano
Blanche Persky

University of Nebraska Staff:
  Richard Graham
  Ned Hedges
  Thomas R. Holland
  Dorothy Howard
  William Long
  Dolores Mather
  Paul Olson
  Frances Reinehr
  Frank Rice
  Hugh Rudorf
  Geoffrey Summerfield
  Les Whipp

Gene Hardy: Project and Conference Coordinator

Introduction

The following is the report of the Fifth National Conference of the Tri-University Project. The conference is perhaps its last national conference, certainly the last of this sort. For a new project for the trainers of teachers has come into existence at more than fifty sites: the Tri-University program has been absorbed in it; and where there were three efforts, there are now fifty. The new project will be carrying on its own national dialogues; Tri-University will be part of them. But the dialogues will be different. There will be smaller meetings; hopefully they will be better focused and more closely related to action than our talk across the last two years has been.

In the volume are contained speeches offering perspectives on the education of teachers by some of the most distinguished people in America: Virgil Boyd; Don Davies; Don Smith; Jerome Bruner; Kenneth Boulding; Wayne Booth; Robert Fox; Fanny Shaftel; Arthur Pearl.

The group is a distinguished and powerful group. To the claim of previous conferences that we should educate, for America's elementary schools, teachers and administrators who want to bring into the schools all of America's communities and the best that knowledge and freedom can provide, it added the claim that the rest of America must be "got in" too: America's industry, the agony and beauty of its streets; its policy questions and political patterns of problem solving; its exchange economy and use of money to guide men; and, finally, the free intellectual atmosphere which is available to, or putatively available to, Higher Education. If this seems like a large bill, it is perhaps deceptively so, for it is only an index of the degree to which we have forgotten to include children in our forums. They no longer sit as apprentices in our guilds or wander through our shops; they no longer participate in our tribal councils or reason with us; they are not paid for what they do, and they do not choose their school "goods" as other men choose theirs. They are not offered arenas of discussion and action which easily touch on the arenas of discussion and action of adult life.[1] We appear to have lost much of the art necessary to a society if it is to have the respect of its apprentices (which is a more pointed way of formulating the particulars of the way in which we do not know how to teach). And, finally, we are not certain as to what exactly we know the young would like to, or need to, learn from us as our apprentices.

---

[1] Jan H. Van den Berg, The Changing Nature of Man, (New York, 1961), pp. 42-43; cf. pp. 20-188 passim.

The speeches which follow specify some directions which might be in order were we to do a better job of apprenticing people in our society. I am particularly taken by the notion of moving the factory (or workshop), the policy-and-action forum, and the expressive life of the street into the school.

Mr. Boulding's remarks about the "economics" of the educational process may well have more effect upon education than the whole of the Tri-University Project.

Previous conferences of the project have brought to the nation's attention the perceptions concerning the education of the teachers of other groups of people as distinguished as those who speak in the book.[2] Altogether the five conferences have brought together as diverse and powerful a group as has addressed America with respect to the plight of its education.

I come to the end of this series with something of despair -- partly because so much has been said that is good and powerful by good and powerful people while what has been said has not been what has been done. When Mr. Howe recently resigned as Commissioner of Education, he included in his final speech an indication of despair at America's schools; for all of the money and effort spent in eradicating their racism and racial injustice, they still retain a deep odor of racism. I am not sure that our national educational policies or other national policies -- in the areas of housing, police protection or whatever -- have been so much designed to eradicate the odor of racism as to cover it. Our schools in most sections of the United States are as segregated now as when the Supreme Court desegregation decision was made over a decade ago. We simply do not care all that much.

My feelings with respect to the education of teachers are somewhat similar. I have been seriously involved in public education for almost a decade, but I doubt that very much of it is much better for my having been involved and for the involvement of other so-called "reformers". Perhaps we suggested reform in stupid or wrong directions. Certainly we lacked will. And we also saw the lack of a serious will in American

---

[2] Jerrold Zacharias, Douglas Oliver, Paul Ward, Ernest Chambers, Herbert Kohl, Robert Hess, John Holt, Dick Foster, Anthony Gibbs, Jimmy Britten, Alice Neuendorf, Eleanor Duckworth, Vernon Haubrich, Jim Drake, John Flavell, Sue Easterling, William Iverson, Alton Becker, Louise Bufford, J. McVicker Hunt, Jules Henry, Zi Graves, Fred Gearing, Armin Beck, Arthur Singer, Raymond English, Donald Bigelow, Dan Griffiths, Ernest Morial, John Dick, Robert Norris, Martin Garrison, Freeman Butts, Charles Burgess, Virginia Shipman, Tony Milazzo and David Reed, and others.

Higher Education. It has not recruited and trained teachers of a quality markedly different from those we have had. The country has lacked the will. Chancellors do not lose their jobs for failing to create universities which educate teachers competent to keep lives from rotting. They lose jobs for failing to manage student unrest, for failing to get NSF science development grants, for tolerating the action of black or white militant racists; but they do not lose jobs for creating institutions which recruit and educate bad teachers. Mr. Booth will not lose his job if the University of Chicago educates no teachers or trains mostly bad ones; Mr. Bruner's Harvard will go on as usual if it does no better; so will my University of Nebraska. Mr. Boyd's company has to train its own teachers; it is only beginning to see that it might be able to offer insight into the training of school teachers -- even elementary school teachers.

The Office of Education and the Congress have not given to the education of teachers what they have given to buildings for Higher Education, or health research or institutional development grants in the sciences; and very little of our national economic policy work is focused on what the nation should provide to support the teachers of its young. We simply do not care all that much. Our best hope lies in the rebellion of the parents of children whose lives are being tossed aside.

I could speak at length of ways in which I personally have failed, but that would be a rhetorical penance in this context. What is important is that the collective power of the people who have appeared at Tri-University conferences, certainly the collective influence of people who have participated in the conferences, can affect mightily what America's colleges and schools demand as to level of intellectual competence and as to humanity, in teachers and teachers-to-be. What is needed are their voices and actions in their own institutions now, their voices and the voices and actions of parents and of Mr. Bruner's "commando teams." We surely have the power and the resources to educate all of our young. I wonder whether we have the will. In any case, talk will not move the Tri-University Project very much further.

Paul A. Olson

A Child's First Education and American Industry's New Entrance Into Education

Virgil E. Boyd
President, Chrysler Corporation

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to be with a group of prime movers in American education, although I will admit to some hesitancy at first. It has been quite some time since I had any direct involvement in elementary education, which might be all to the good -- I remember having a hard enough time helping my children with the old math. But after I browsed through the minutes of some of your discussion group meetings in the 1967 and 1968 conferences, it became clear to me that knowing all the answers wasn't a prerequisite for admission.

In fact, I don't even know all the questions. But I do know that the importance of what you are trying to accomplish here, of raising the questions and searching for the answers, is becoming increasingly evident to American business. It is likely, necessary in fact, that we get more interested, more helpful, and possibly more involved.

Business and industry, of course, have always been involved in some form of the educational process, in terms of training people for the on-the-job application of previously acquired knowledge, and in communicating a variety of special skills. Many of the major companies engage in more formal educational processes. My own company, for example, operates the Chrysler Institute, in which we provide employee courses in four areas: first, management, involving appropriate techniques for the foreman right on through department directors and vice presidents; second, marketing practices, including financial management, accounting, salesmanship, and retail management; third, technical education, including pre-employment training, apprenticeship programs and up-grading classes for non-skilled workers; and fourth, academic affairs, in which we work with the nation's institutions of higher education in curriculum planning, and in which we at present offer graduate engineers a master's degree in automotive engineering.

So, we are directly involved in education at the plant level. And in a very real sense, we are totally dependent on education, or the product of education, for our future growth as a company, and even our existence. Certainly, any real thought must give rise to the conclusion that education -- not steel, or rubber, or zinc -- is the most critical resource in the future of business. And if it is true that trained intelligence is by all odds the most important capital resource of our country --

and I doubt that any here will disagree with that proposition -- then from now on the total educational effort of this country is going to demand more and more support, financial and intellectual, from every sector of our society.

Consider, for example, that experts in the field estimate that something like seven percent of the people of this country have I.Q.'s over 130. That means they could qualify, with proper training and motivation, for distinguished careers in the professions. The same figures show that, of those seven percent with an I.Q. of 130 or more, over 90 percent finish high school, more than 60 percent enter college, and 50 percent graduate from college.

At first glance, these numbers seem to indicate a happy circumstance -- that mentally gifted young people appreciate educational opportunities and tend to stay with the educational process. But if you reverse the equation, you find that four out of every ten of our young people with far better than average intelligence don't even enter college. In quantitative terms, this means that, every year, well over 100,000 gifted young men and women are either unable to enter college, or are not sufficiently motivated to do so. Even more dramatically -- and tragically -- every ten years we fail to provide a college education for considerably more than a million good prospects for the critically important professions. This is a waste of human resources that the nation simply cannot afford.

But because the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of providing as much education as possible for as many people as possible, and because of the high value placed on college education by increasing numbers of families, and because of the heavy demand for professionals in every field, I feel confident that the country will find the means to keep our colleges expanding and improving. And I believe that they will find the means because business will make the means available, and that the tax revenues needed out ahead cannot be provided in any other way than through the self-generating strength of the private business system.

It is true that the cost of higher education will climb sharply in the years ahead. And it is also true that business is the economic foundation for most of the social progress we make. So, keeping it in perspective, if the growth rate of the Gross National Product remains fairly constant in the decade ahead, then the very heavy expenses of our colleges in that decade can be met by a relatively small increase in the percentage of our country's total economic activity that is now being allocated to higher education.

But there is another, and I believe equally pressing, educational demand that we in business are only now beginning to recognize. It involves, in the very literal sense, the topic of this conference -- elementary education. Most of us in business historically have had little involvement in this field. But, as you know, American business has begun to develop a much better defined sense of social responsibility in recent years, and we have started translating that sense of responsibility into responsible action.

For example, several Detroit companies have undertaken direct help programs at individual inner city schools. A year ago, Chrysler went to Northwestern High School, which has a predominantly Negro population, and asked what we could do to help. The faculty outlined its needs, and we instituted the programs, in many instances providing the necessary equipment and instructors. There have been some failures and frustrations, but the successes far outweigh them. So far we have inaugurated vocational tests for all seniors, a three-year automobile mechanics training program, a cooperative on-the-job training program with a major oil company, a variety of curriculum changes in vocational courses to make them relevant to actual job skills, and we have placed 125 graduates in jobs.

And, while we are very pleased with these tangible results, the total effect is more far-reaching. As a newspaper report on the program put it just last week: "What excites school and Chrysler officials -- and the students -- is the feeling that what Chrysler is attempting at Northwestern is only the beginning."

I would be less than honest if I didn't add here that the heightened sense of social responsibility by business was helped along considerably by the violence and unrest in the cities where we do business. My company's headquarters city was among those which fell victim to that violence. In Detroit, and I presume in all other riot-torn communities, it came as a stunning revelation to businessmen that a large segment of the community not only didn't think that the rate of social progress was satisfactory, but were so violently unhappy with it that they wanted to tear it down. We had, after all, made sincere efforts to increase our minority group employment, and to upgrade them through on-the-job training programs. We had set up scholarship funds, matching grants to colleges, and awards to exemplary youth. In addition to our independent programs for the public good we established a record of financial support to social agencies that to this day stands as an example to the business sector of our country's major cities. I don't think we were smug or complacent, but we did think we were moving ahead. Most of us believed that Detroit had established the very model of an enlightened, active, problem-solving community.

So after the smoke had cleared, and the shock had worn off a little, all the responsible leaders of the community launched an almost frantic search to find out what went wrong, and how it could be fixed. They found not one, but many, probable causes. And outstanding among these causes of our crisis was the fact that, in a time when our national economy was rocketing along at a record pace, when unemployment levels were at record lows, many thousands of our citizens were either unemployed or chronically underemployed. They were literally shut out of our history's most affluent society. And the kind of anger that can be generated by this condition was well defined by John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, when he said: "Men can tolerate extraordinary hardship if they think it is an unalterable part of life's travail. But an administered frustration -- unsanctioned by religion, or custom, or deeply rooted values -- is more than the spirit can bear. So, increasingly, men rage at their institutions."

Now, certainly no one in the Detroit business community believed that he had consciously or unconsciously administered the frustration of any man's desire to work. But with the riot ruins still smouldering in the streets, it was not the time to argue that the man who wasn't enjoying the fruits of our burgeoning economy either wasn't a desirable candidate or simply didn't want to work. It was not appropriate to point out we had already hired the ambitious, the acceptable, and the able, and were meeting our moral obligations to the remainder through contributions to charity.

A major part of our crisis was concerned with jobs, and the business community set out to provide them, quickly and in quantity. Those of us in the automobile industry -- and we are the city's major employer -- moved out into the city and set up temporary employment centers. We used sound trucks at street corners and recruited in poolrooms and from pulpits. We practically defied anyone who was unemployed not to take a job. It came as no great surprise that a great majority of these chronically underemployed and unemployed either failed to meet the minimum educational requirements, or had disqualifying police records, or very often, had been unacceptable on both counts. So we drastically lowered our previous educational requirements, we didn't ask for references, and we overlooked police records that previously would have meant disqualification. And we put these people to work -- more than 25,000 men and women so far -- on good-paying, steady jobs in Detroit alone.

Under the JOBS program of the National Alliance of Businessmen, and through programs instituted on our own, the process is being duplicated by the automobile industry across the country, wherever their operations are located. By the target date of June, 1969, it is expected that the industry will have provided jobs for 50,000 of these people nationally, or more than twice the original projection of the JOBS program. Figures from my own company show that three-quarters of them are non-white, compared with about 39 percent of our regular new hires who are non-white. And the figures also show that, given the opportunity to work, these people stick with it just a little better than regular new hires: we keep about 67 percent of regular hires and about 69 percent of the JOBS program people.

There are some obvious implications in those statistics, but rather than go into them now, I would prefer to take this opportunity to tell you about a closely related experience, and what we are learning from it, because I believe it bears more directly on the subject of your conference. When we went out into the streets with our recruiters, we found not only the unemployed and the underemployed, we found what has become known as a "hard core" of people for whom new rules and new policies were no help at all. They were literally unemployable. Some of them had absolutely no skills, no work history, no knowledge at all of the industrial environment in which they lived. They didn't know the simplest arithmetic, their environmental language problems seriously hampered communication with them, and they couldn't so much as sign a job application, let alone fill it out.

Because we had set out to provide a job for every man who wanted one -- and because of a certain degree of enlightened self-interest -- my company, for one, entered into an agreement with the federal government to start an experimental program designed to do whatever had to be done to pre-train these people for work -- really elementary education -- how to read the names of colors, "in" and "out" signs on doors, how to count and how to add. And the first thing that became clear to us was that most of these people who didn't make it through elementary school some 10 or 20 years ago weren't going to make it this time either. A lot of them weren't showing up for training, or were consistently late. It didn't take very long to find out why. When a grown man gets put off a bus because he couldn't read and got on the wrong one, the humiliation keeps him from getting on very many more buses. And how can you get to work on time if you don't own an alarm clock? You don't pay hard-earned money for an alarm clock if never before in your life has anyone expected you to be at any particular place at any particular time. If a some-time dishwasher or a day laborer fails to show up for work, well, he wasn't really expected to anyway.

And that's what we were up against. A history of being expected to fail, and of living up to that expectation, from the first grade right on through the first job. The hard core people were completely convinced that they couldn't learn, and had long since given up trying. It was true not only in Detroit, but everywhere we started the program, in Los Angeles and Akron, in St. Louis and Dayton. But it is also true that in these cities, and every other city in which we've entered combat against this kind of culturally-imposed impoverishment, we have scored heartening victories. And while a year's experience in no way qualifies us as experts, I'd like to tell you a little of what we did and what we learned in these encounters.

In many cases we started out the first day, and the second, and even the third, by sending a man, a counselor, out to the trainee's home, to guide him step by step through the procedure for simply getting to the classroom. On the way into the plant, the counselor would point out the employee's parking lot, filled with cars owned by workers who drove them to homes also owned by the workers -- owned because they lived within the rules of an industrial society and showed up for work, on time, every day. We chose our counselors carefully. They were men who could communicate with these trainees, who could be trusted and confided in, and who provided an image of success. And they were able to solve the motivation problem with surprisingly little difficulty.

Inside the plant, we located the classroom close to the job, and kept the class work periods short enough to retain interest, we devoted the remaining time to imparting job skills in the plant, using standard production equipment. In our Toledo Machining Plant, for example, a current class of some 35 hard core trainees is operating a sort of plant within a plant. Right alongside regular employees who are turning out brake parts and power pumps, these trainees are building ash trays out of scrapped parts. There are 16 separate work stations, from grinding and welding to spray painting. And every one of these 16 steps to building an ash tray coincides exactly with an entry-level job on the regular production line.

We have found in this, and other plants, that after only six or eight weeks of class work and "hands-on" training most of these people, who were so recently totally unemployable, are ready for job assignment. And, more important, we have found that while our retention rate for regular hires is about 67 percent, the retention rate for those hard core alumni is an almost unheard of 82 percent. This retention rate has convinced us that the change in attitude -- attitude toward the job, the supervisor, toward self-discipline, and toward failure -- is far more critical than the imparting of skills.

We have found the teaching of English and arithmetic is far easier, and more successful, when it is job-oriented rather than class-oriented. And we also have found, in an impressive number of cases, that along with changes in motivation and attitude, the trainee jumps as much as two school grade levels in achievement in a very few weeks.

Admittedly, our instructors and counselors have a distinct advantage. They can make their own rules and policies as experience dictates. They enjoy what has been proved an essential one-to-one relationship with the new trainee at the start, and a 15 to 1 student-teacher ratio throughout the program. The student is being paid to come to class, and the objective -- a good paying job -- is always clearly visible right across the aisle. And even then, they don't always succeed. We lose about 18 percent of the enrollment, mostly because of problems like alcoholism, narcotics addiction, and physical inability to perform. But the 82 percent who succeed, those 82 men and women out of 100, who had been drifting without hope in the backwaters of our society, they have added a new dimension -- a fine new dimension -- to the corporate entity.

I have been in Chrysler facilities where the manager is so interested in and proud of his pre-employment training program that he would have spent more time telling me about it than about his own production problems. I have seen men and women whose job assignments are not even remotely connected with the program volunteer to give of their time and their talent to provide an extra measure of help in shaping these salvaged lives. I have seen important changes in attitude not only on the part of those being helped, but of those doing the helping, and I am pleased and encouraged by what I have seen.

I am not at all suggesting that my industry, or the total business community, has become in a year's time the epitome of racial harmony and Christian attitudes. We are still without question beset by fears, hostilities and resentments. But there is activity, there is learning, and there is progress. We, as businessmen have gained new perspective, we have extended and reinforced an old rule of business -- that men can rise above themselves to meet a challenge, that men do their best when the best is expected of them. And if those things we have learned are things that you, as professional educators, have long known, then perhaps you can be encouraged by the hope that a new understanding and a new involvement by the prime movers of the American economy will help move all of us closer to the kind of realization of the American dream that has so long been your goal.

Beyond a Sense of Outrage

Don Davies
Associate Commissioner for Educational
Personnel Development
U. S. Office of Education

The most important potential product of the Tri-University program will not be meetings such as this, but will be the band of people who have participated in the project who will go forth from it as emissaries for reform and renewal and change in American education. And included in that band of emissaries, I suppose, would be many of the rest of us who share in the purposes of this project even though we may not be immediate participants. I hope that those of you who are participating in the project and are close to it in some way are beginning to develop some adequate sense of outrage about the difference between education as it is and education as it might be in our society.

While outrage has some useful motivating characteristics, it seems to me that outrage and combativeness will clearly not be enough for you or for me who are interested in change in education. If we choose villain hunting and if we choose the joys of combat and adversary relationships over the tedious, mundane job of changing institutions and changing ourselves, we may have a very good time at it but we won't accomplish very much. I've been convinced for a long time that one of the reasons most efforts at reform in American education fail is that the focus is usually on the input rather than on the output. The focus is usually on talking a good game rather than on the results, and I think Mr. Boyd and his colleagues in American industry could teach us a good deal about how to focus on output rather than input.

John Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who happens also to be a person I admire greatly, has written a good deal on the topic of institutional change. In a speech last summer, he looked back at the twentieth century through the eyes of a twenty-third century scholar. In doing so, he made some especially astute observations about our present institutions. He pointed out that they were caught in a savage cross fire between "uncritical lovers" and "unloving critics." On the one side were those who loved their institutions and tended to smother them in an embrace of death, loving their rigidities more than their promise, shielding them from life-giving criticism. On the other hand, there arose a breed of critics without love, skilled in demolition, but untutored in the arts by which human institutions are nurtured and strengthened and made to flourish. Between the two, the institutions perished.

Now if this is not to be the result, clearly we must design institutions capable of continuous change, continuous renewal, and continuous responsiveness. For us in education, this task is far more difficult than designing a new curriculum for next semester, reorganizing the school for next year, or any of the other kinds of projects in which we are typically engaged. It's a much more difficult job to devise ways whereby our institutions and our projects and our plans will contain those self-corrective devices which are absolutely essential for institutional and individual renewal.

I'd like to try to move beyond my own sense of outrage about the inadequacies in American education today and propose to you some positive directions. Some of you probably saw James Reston's column in The New York Times in which he was talking about the conflicts in America. There was one point in that column which hit me very hard. He said that, "Despite the violent local problems today, there are reassuring larger tendencies." As I thought about that, I tried to identify what these "reassuring larger tendencies" were in education. I've identified three of them which I would like to suggest as tendencies deserving your analysis, your support, and your consideration as you proceed in the next few days in this conference. I can sum them up in three infinitives -- to equalize, to individualize, and to humanize. I'd like to talk just a bit about each one.

In the last decade we have made some measurable and specific progress toward equalizing educational opportunity for youngsters coming into our school systems. The data are not very hard and they're not very specific but I think most of us can feel and see some signs of progress. I hope most of us can see and feel some positive impact of some of the federal programs -- Head Start, Title I, the Teacher Corps, etc.

There is now what there wasn't a decade ago -- strong bipartisan political support for a continuing large-scale federal contribution to the educational problems of children of low-income families. Across the country, there does seem to be some movement and some concern, but quite obviously only a beginning has been made. Race and family income still remain the predominant determinants of the quantity and quality of the education that a young person is going to receive in our society. Poverty, hunger, malnutrition, disease and racial discrimination are still burdens for millions of youngsters in thousands of classrooms. Most poverty area schools are still inadequate. They're inadequate in facilities, in buildings, in teachers, in curriculum, and in many other ways.

I would submit that the reassuring larger tendency is clearly toward equalizing educational opportunity. And it's clear to me that the job we must do is to change our motivations, our attitudes, and the skills of people who serve the schools and those who control the schools. It's clear to me, too, that what needs to be done to support this larger tendency is to work with people to enable them to support it. Of course, this is a training problem.

The second reassuring larger tendency in education today is the move toward individualizing education. The importance of individual differences has been an important part of the mythology in education for a century; we've talked about it and written about it almost endlessly. Rhetoric about individual differences is with us at every moment, but little of the rhetoric has been translated into the working lives of teachers and children in schools -- very little of it. The large group, the teacher doing all the talking, and the standardized examinations and standardized requirements are still the reality, despite the mythology of "reform."

I think there are some encouraging signs, however, which would support my contention that there is a reassuring larger tendency here. The developments in educational technology are leading the way, of course: programmed instruction, the use of the computer in various ways, and other appropriate applications of technology are beginning to make certain kinds of individualizing of instruction possible in classrooms for the first time. In addition to these technological developments, there are significant trends toward new and more flexible ways of organizing time and talent in the school to make possible the kind of individualizing that we've always talked about, but have seldom been able to practice.

But of course, only a beginning has been made. Mass instruction and "teacher talk" are still the predominant characteristics of our system. Our concept of education continues to be twenty-five to fifty young people in a room with a teacher in the front of the room, the youngsters listening and writing and the teacher talking for a good deal of the time. The concept of the self-contained teacher in the self-contained classroom still prevails, along with the very strange notion that it's possible to have a million and a half elementary school teachers who are omnicapable and omnivirtuous. The requirements in schools, and of course in colleges, are still largely standardized, and the potential and achievement of youngsters are still measured by standardized tests which have a powerful impact on the lives of the taker, whether or not they have reliability or validity.

Now it's clear to me that the job to be done to support and expedite this tendency toward individualizing education, again is largely a job of changing motivations and attitudes and knowledge and skills of the people who serve education -- the aides, the teachers, the supervisors, the administrators and all of the rest of us. Individualizing educational experiences requires different concepts and skills from those which the conventional program requires. This clearly is a training problem.

The third of the three larger tendencies that I'd like to talk about tonight is the tendency toward humanizing education. Now in many ways this is the least developed, the most controversial, the most vague, and the most difficult to explain. This could mean lots of different things to lots of different people, and it's a very difficult objective to achieve. I'd like to try to clarify what I mean by humanizing education.

One part of what I mean was expressed well by the Princeton anthropologist, Melvin Tumin, when he wrote as follows: "The most egregious failure of the current schools is the failure to be concerned with goals of education beyond those of the limited cognitive skills. Other goals can be named. They include the acquisition of a satisfying self-image, a capacity to live with differences, a vital interest in participation as citizens, sound emotional development, and a continuing refinement of tastes and sensibilities." To humanize education, then, means to attend to the affective and the behavioral sides of learning as well as to the cognitive.

Another aspect of humanizing education is expressed well by Richard Farson of the Western Institute for Behavioral Sciences, who wrote as follows: "We still appear to believe that students must be driven to learn by discipline, punishment, competition, and reward. We have so long used punitive methods in our teaching, viewing pain and suffering as an avenue to learning, that it may now be impossible for us to accept the idea that learning can be enjoyable, that it should not entail frustration or boredom, punishment or failure, dread, shame, or panic."

And of course many of you have seen George Leonard's new book, Education and Ecstasy, which is devoted entirely to the need and the means for humanizing education along these lines. Leonard is concerned with the tendency of schools and of the people who serve in schools to make education dull, lifeless, routinized, without joy. He is concerned that schools tend to repress the creative powers of young people rather than encourage them.

In very simple terms, humanizing education means to begin to treat children -- students -- as human beings. That's the simplest way of putting it. It means to begin to treat them as subjects rather than objects, treat them as people with strengths and weaknesses and problems and personality and potential, people with faces, people with identity. Humanizing education means to me that the schools should devote themselves primarily to developing human potential rather than to degrading and sorting and weeding out. What Mr. Boyd had to say about the expectation of failure which confronts many youngsters from the time they begin in school to the time that they are in this unemployable category, is exactly what I'm talking about. I think it's a terribly useful and significant point.

Now there are signs to support the existence of a larger tendency toward humanizing education; some of them are signs that we don't like very much. The most important, I think, is the rebellion of many young people against the predominant values of our society and against irrelevant and impersonal education. Some of these developments have obviously captured the attention of educators and politicians and citizens everywhere. They frighten us, but they are reminders that a very substantial number of young people are telling us something about the irrelevance and joylessness and impersonality of their education as they see it; and their activities, as painful as they are for us, are beginning to produce some action in schools and on college campuses toward a more humanized and a more personalized approach to education. There's no question about that -- the student riots and all of the student activities are beginning to produce results on college campuses.

The mushrooming of current interest in sensitivity training, encounter groups, simulation and other related activities is further evidence of widespread need and concern about humanizing the educational process. But I'm afraid we've only made a beginning. The task of humanizing education, again, is largely a task of changing the motivations and the attitudes and the skills and the knowledge and the feelings of those people who serve education -- the aides, the teachers, the administrators, the counselors, and all of the rest of us who are in this business. This is a massive as well as a significant task.

Every project and every enterprise in which we engage at the Office of Education that has to do with educational manpower and training and all of the activities under the Education Professions Development Act can contribute very directly to supporting these larger tendencies which I have identified tonight.

But I want to suggest two specific things for your consideration as potentially major contributions to supporting the tendencies toward individualizing and equalizing and humanizing. These are two illustrations of many actions which you might consider. The first is this: I'd like to propose that in each of the two hundred or so school districts which have been touched directly by the Tri-University Project and others that have been involved with it and close to it in some way, we recruit fifty people from low income families and place them in schools in career ladder programs during the next two years. This would provide new jobs in schools for approximately one hundred thousand people from low income families. These programs should provide for pay and meaningful opportunity to continue academic study on the part of the participants. They should provide pre-service training for the entry level job as a teacher aide and an opportunity to progress to other, more responsible jobs in the school by preparation and experience.

If we did this, we would be doing a good deal more than providing a hundred thousand jobs for people who previously didn't have jobs and didn't have much hope, we would be bringing into the schools new talent and new diversity. We would be bringing in new energy. For example, we would bring Mexican-American mothers into the classroom to provide a cultural and a language bridge for Anglo teachers and administrators to Mexican-American youngsters. We would bring to the school different talents and talents that are not often found there now, and we would make it possible, because of the new talents that are there, to differentiate the allocation of jobs in the school. Perhaps most important of all, the new recruits and the existing teachers would help educate one another in very important and very human ways.

Under the Education Professions Development Act, we have a new program called the Career Opportunities Program that can support this kind of activity in part, but it's going to require the initiative and the interest and the motivation of people in schools and colleges across the country to make this happen.

The second action proposal I'd like to make which might contribute to the accomplishment of the kinds of objectives I sketched earlier, is this: I would like to see established during the next two years at least two hundred clinical schools which will be part of public school systems, but which can serve as a new kind of development and training center for the school and for one or more colleges. These clinical centers will be placed where specialists in the disciplines, educationists, community people, college students, parents, and others come together to teach children, to develop curriculum, to develop new approaches to teaching, and probably most important, to teach one another.

Each of these centers that I'm proposing should commit itself to the testing of a variety of training approaches, training approaches that are designed to have a real impact on the behavior of all of those people being trained. This includes children and all of the staff involved. I would ask each of them to make a very rare commitment to consistency in the way the children are taught to teach the children. It would be marvelously refreshing to establish a clinical school center which was entirely consistent in the rules and regulations and approaches for the adults and the children and the community who are participating in the school.

No vast sums of federal money are required for this effort. I would suggest that funds now being spent on what are often unproductive in-service teacher training activities by schools and colleges might very well be diverted to the establishment and operation of such centers. At the risk of incurring your great wrath, I'll suggest some possibly unproductive activities that might be dispensed with. The very expensive supervision of student teaching by itinerant college supervisors is one nominee. Another nominee would be the myriad traditional in-service education activities conducted by school districts, which are best characterized by bringing in the "outside expert" to talk to the teachers.

These two schemes [i. e. employing low income families in the schools and starting a system of clinical schools throughout the country], I would suggest, are illustrative of specific activities which are obviously necessary to support and encourage the kind of larger tendencies I identified earlier. Talking about such ideas is not effective without the systematic, tedious and mundane work that it takes in order to achieve actual changes within the institutions.

I have one final point. Much of my energy in the last decade has been devoted to bringing about a kind of ecumenical movement in education. First, this was at the NEA; now at the Office of Education. I still happen to believe very strongly that we're going to get more progress and better education at all levels if we can engage simultaneously a variety of people in the process. I'm talking about people from the disciplines, the educationists, the practitioners from the schools. And of course, I'm talking about the students, the clients. And I'm talking about the parents and the people from the community.

I happen to believe very firmly that we're going to get more powerful and more positive educational programs if all of these people are involved together in a collaborative way in developing, conducting, evaluating, and renewing and changing these programs.

It seems to me that everything that we do under the Education Professions Development Act is going to have the intention at least of encouraging and supporting this kind of coalition. It seems to me also that the Tri-University Project can be a very important demonstration that collaboration of this kind is worthwhile; it's worth the effort because of the results it produces.

The Street Is the Community School

Donald H. Smith
University of Pittsburgh

I have known many streets, some intimately, others only in passing. My streets are ugly, they are mean, Piri Thomas, but they are also beautiful.

Lennox Avenue in Harlem, Centre Avenue in Pittsburgh, Filmore Street in San Francisco, Auburn Avenue in Atlanta, 14th Street in Washington, D.C. and South Parkway, now Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, in Chicago are my streets; they are the streets of all Black people in America.

And every day upon those streets the drama of a magnificent race of people is played. Slaves they were who would be free and will not die. Slumped shoulders not yet all straight, but getting there. The frail old woman who struggles alone with a small sack of welfare groceries; the teen-ager who dashes from college class to his job at the post office; the pimp, white on white, pushing his hog; the old men who play checkers and tell tales; the young couple who save for a home; the girls who stand and wait -- all belong to the street, and the street belongs to them.

Claude Brown describes in Manchild in the Promised Land the love relationship that black people have with the streets:

> I used to feel that I belonged on the Harlem streets, and that, regardless of what I did, nobody had any business to take me off the streets.
>
> I remember when I ran away from shelters, places that they sent me to, here in the city. I never ran away with the thought in mind of coming home. I always ran away to get back to the streets. I always thought of Harlem as home, but I never thought of Harlem as being in the house. To me home was the streets.

Perhaps not each individually, but collectively, the street people are beautiful. And the most beautiful of all are the babes, the children. The little ones love everybody. Mama, daddy, policeman, fireman, doctor man, all the world. They especially love their teachers, as they enter school bursting with eagerness to learn.

But, alas, the prophets of cognitive doom tell us that the children have come to school irreparably damaged, never to recover from the absence of standard English, magazines and books and trips to the museum. The schools and teachers behave as if it were so, the children's excitement is extinguished, and the light goes out.

Because many of the children who come from black and Hispanic and other communities designated as disadvantaged, either do not know how or do not choose to play the "School Game," they are presumed to be incapable of learning. The learnings and skills the children do bring with them are unrecognized by teachers who have never known or have forgotten the lessons of growing up on the street.

The street is the community school for millions of poor American children. What do they learn there? From earliest infancy right to the grave, the children learn to solve the most fundamental of human needs: how to survive in a predatory society. Residents of the ghetto who may differ in many other respects, such as income, education, religious preference and life style, nevertheless share at least one common bond: the need to withstand assaults from without and from within the community.

To grow up in the inner city is to be ever on guard against the takers and the abusers. The children and their families are abused by almost all of the institutions in the community. They are cheated of their paltry earnings and relief checks by grocers and druggists who sell them inferior, sometimes rotten, merchandise at outrageous prices. They are preyed upon by crooked furniture and clothing merchants and merciless auto salesmen. And they are taken by various door-to-door salesmen and conmen. And yet the financial violation of black people is only a part of the institutional abuse to which they are subjected. Even more devastating than the economic subversion is the assault on personality which is a daily experience in the ghetto. Clerks in stores, social workers, elevator operators, doctors, lawyers and bus drivers are but a few of the insulting psychological assailants who talk to children and their families as if they were non-human. Walk into any public assistance office or a clinic or a supermarket and witness the continued put-downs, the embarassment, the hurt which the poor are obliged to suffer because they have no power to command respect.

Perhaps no institution in the community is more guilty of this shameful treatment than is the school. Last year I was visiting a friend of mine who teaches at an elementary school in Harlem. As I was about to walk into the washroom, I saw a group of children, about third grade, who were walking down the corridor with their teacher. As the line proceeded down the hall, one of the children started to straggle. His teacher grabbed him violently and shouted at him, and the small child cowered back into the line. I was depressed as I entered the bathroom. No sooner had I washed my hands and exited when there appeared another line of children, these about fifth grade. One little boy looked up at me and said, "Hey, how ya doin'?" I responded with, "O.K., How you doin'?" Before I could finish the sentence his teacher approached him menacingly with a yardstick and then glowered at me. And I shared the child's terror. Within five minutes in one school I had witnessed the intimidation and brutality that characterize teacher-pupil relationships in too many inner-city elementary schools. Institutional abuse is a part of growing up in Black America.

Even more deadly than the violence inflicted by institutions is that perpetrated by the unorganized and organized criminal elements that plague black communities. Thieves who fleece their brothers, Saturday night surgeons who turn their own self-hatred into carving and shooting sprees upon other black people, and juvenile gangs who pillage property and maim other youths are all a part of the pathological condition that White America has set upon Black America.

Of special irony is the phenomenon of organized crime in the ghetto. In an era in which "Law and Order" is the byword of political candidates and super patriots, the big-time criminals, the syndicates and the Mafia, are allowed to flourish with impunity, not only in the ghetto, but in the nation at large.

The presence of narcotics vendors and policy peddlers is a scourge in black communities. At the cost of destroying the lives of countless numbers of young people and their families, organized criminals are allowed to profiteer in the billions. Drugs and numbers are so lucrative that many men have lost their lives and others will be killed who attempt to cut in on or to bring a halt to these illegal practices.

I suppose, of equal irony is the fact that middle and upper-class whites are now beginning to pay the dear price for indifference, for allowing law enforcers to look the other way while black children were destroyed by drugs. The scourge has come to infest white America, too.

Obviously there are other abuses, such as the sensory abuses of ugly buildings, garbage, rats, urine, and the incessant noise of buses, elevated trains, cars, trucks, soul music, church shouts, children and mother screams. These are all a part of the lives of people in the ghetto.

But no predator, no aggressor, no sensory attacker thus far discussed, has as crushing and as odious an effect on black people as have the police and their occasional bedfellows, the national guard and the armed forces.

It doesn't take long for the tots of Head Start and Follow Through to learn that the big man in the nice blue uniform is the same man who hurts brothers and fathers, and even sisters and mothers. One cannot drive the streets of Black America without witnessing or experiencing the disrespect, the cruelty, and, in many cases, the barbarity of White America's protectors. For a black boy to be dogged and manhandled by police is a way of life. Guilty or innocent, his treatment is the same.

In the fall of 1967, three black male high school students were walking along the streets of the Southside of Chicago when they decided to cut through the alley: nothing unusual in Black America. If the street is home, the alley is the back yard. As these young students walked down the alley, a car approached rapidly and began to use a blinding spotlight. This was a technique being commonly used by youth gangs to prey upon non-members of the gang. Consequently the three young men began to run from what appeared to be danger. Little did they know that their danger was in the form of two policemen, one of whom fired several shots. And one boy, the captain of his high school football team and a member of the national honor society, fell dead. Subsequent investigations established that neither the slain boy nor his companions had committed any criminal act. The white policeman who killed a boy for running was exonerated.

A few months ago a black man was killed by a white policeman in Washington, D. C., for jaywalking. Not long after the holocaust in Watts in 1965, a white policeman stopped a young black man who was speeding his pregnant wife to a hospital; Watts had no hospital, then. Some angry words were exchanged and the young father to-be was shot dead.

John Hersey has written a chilling account of law and order in America in his book The Algiers Motel Incident. The incident to which Mr. Hersey referred took place in Detroit during the Black rebellion of 1967. Three young black men, unarmed non-participants in the street insurrection, had sought refuge, along with a few of their friends, in an annex of the Algiers Motel. A contingent of Detroit police officers and National Guardsmen entered the annex and savagely beat, tortured, and murdered the three young men. One was beaten until an eye came out of its socket, then, as he pleaded for mercy, his arm was shot off. Another young man, helpless, begging for his life, had his sexual organ blasted from his body. All three were shot at close range. It is a matter of record that two police officers confessed the killings. It is also a matter of record that a year and a half after the murders all of the lawmen still walk the streets free. A strange, but not unusual act of injustice. Tragically, these examples I have cited are not the exception. They are typical of the terror and barbarism with which Black people must contend from those who are there to protect them.

As Grier and Cobbs point out in Black Rage, "In every part of the nation [Black people] are subjected to physical and verbal abuse, humiliation, unlawful search and seizure, and embarrassment by authorities." The ruthlessness of Mayor Daley's stormtroopers in Chicago last August shocked many white Americans who rose up in righteous indignation calling for probes and denunciations. Those young white students who were set upon in what the Walker Report termed a "police riot," were glimpsing from afar the police riot that takes place in Black America everyday. To have a uniform of the law is to have a hunting license which excludes no class or sex. Open season on Black people is the practice, if not the law, of the land.

A little child growing up amidst such violence to personality and person soon learns to adapt himself to the exigencies of life in a very tough world. Fortunately, he learns to develop an extensive repertoire of coping devices that will give him a chance to survive.

One tool he puts to use is language. His language, taught to him by his mother and significant others, has been forged in a long journey from the shores of Africa through the rural South and into the cities, North and South. It is a language jealously acquired in an historical context in which white slave owners deliberately dispersed Africans who spoke the same dialect, in an effort to prevent communication. In that same historical context is the fact that laws were passed which made it illegal to teach slaves to read or to write. Yet, in spite of these systematic efforts to keep Black people manageable through ignorance, many slaves developed varying skills in reading and writing, and most importantly they developed a system of oral communication which allowed slaves to communicate "safely" in an environment that threatened life and limb. A clever combination of the muddled response, the rapid phrase, the double entendre, the esoteric meaning, the unique patterning and the sprinkling of African terms, created a black idiom that served both communicative and protective needs. Such is the linguistic heritage the children bring to school. It is a vital part of their culture, and the older they become the more versatility they develop in speaking the protective language of their community.

Another aspect of the Black inner-city child's verbal development is his facility in telling the convincing lie. His need to protect himself has enabled him to learn how to present his mother, his teacher and other authority figures with highly developed prevarications, upon which he can build, with the slightest prodding, other, even more highly developed lies.

Another quality the street academy teaches its pupils is to distrust, to be suspicious, and to be ever on guard against the melange of takers from outside and from within the community. In a society where people are buffeted about, threatened and kicked, it is normal for them to respond with distrust of most or all people. It is too difficult for Black people to sort out who is trustworthy and who is not. Historically, life and death have depended upon the ability to make such decisions quickly. Therefore, until friends prove themselves in numerous ways, they are assumed to be enemies. It follows, then, that a teacher, must demonstrate her friendship again and again. If she is sincere, most of the children will accept her, and many will come to trust her. But if she is an enemy no matter how she pretends they will all detect it and respond in kind with dislike, hostility and rebelliousness. Black people possess a supersensitivity, not to be confused with hypersensitivity, whose alarm mechanism is triggered when enemies are near. Whether these adversaries are black or white is immaterial. The bell rings with the approach of any impending social danger. Of course, occasionally the device can be wrong, but the burden of proof is on him who would work with Black people and be taken into their councils.

Another outgrowth of the street school is the development of a brilliant hustler culture. Young men and women thought to be too dumb to be taught in traditional schools, learn in the community schools creative, survival skills that far exceed anything the public schools might offer. They learn to shuck and jive, to psyche and be cool, to take and not be taken very often. To win and not lose very often. They learn the social psychology of interpreting and anticipating the behavior of other hustlers and of potential marks. The hustler has a keen sense for where the money is, where the action is, and he can get a piece of the action. The street and the night are his classroom. He learns well and teaches the younger ones how to make it, how to acquire money in a society that denies jobs to uneducated Blacks.

Clearly, not all, not even most of the youngsters in the ghetto are hustlers, but most of them grow up in an environment where hustling is a common survival technique. To have no game is to be naked and vulnerable; hence, most of the youngsters have some game, even if only a small one. To be a child of the ghetto is, in fact, to have very little childhood. Learning how to make it, and having to use that learning frequently makes little men and little women out of little boys and girls. Growing up very fast, and aging very early, the children learn to fend for themselves and to protect their younger siblings.

Another attribute which the children of the street develop is that of fierce in-group loyalty. Let a stranger walk into a Black community and ask the whereabouts of one of its members. Nobody knows; nobody ever heard of him. That supersensory perception is called into play when caseworkers, truant officers, police, bill collectors and any other interlopers invade the community.

As best they can Black communities attempt to protect their own from outside forces. In spite of the many hazards which exist within Black communities, an inhabitant feels a sense of security that fades quickly if the person has to leave his turf, especially if he finds himself in the territory of white people. This reaction is well described in Rage in Harlem by Chester Himes. The hero of this hilarious satire, Rage in Harlem, is Jackson, a man who is constantly victimized by almost improbable circumstances. In one particular episode Jackson is attempting to extricate himself from one of his many crises by borrowing a hearse. Driving along at a merry clip, only a few minutes ahead of the police, he suddenly discovers that he is about to cross the boundary between Harlem and white Manhattan. To leave Harlem is more frightening than being chased by the police, so he turns around and heads in the direction of his pursuers.

In another segment of this same delightful book, Jackson has inadvertently created a riot in Harlem and is frantically trying to get out of the area. He spots the unattended horse and wagon of a junk man. Slipping under the reins, he begins to drive off, when the junk man sees him and shouts "Stop Thief." Enter the fuzz, who are about to arrest Jackson. At once Jackson gives the junk man a look of terror. Not unexpectedly, the junk man says, "Son, I didn't know it was you. It's alright officer; this is my boy," and the two drive off, arm on shoulder. Such are the loyalties in the Black communities. Such are the loyalties I experienced in Montgomery, Alabama in 1963. Two weeks after the assassination of President Kennedy, I was in Montgomery doing doctoral research on Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Montgomery Bus Boycott. The atmosphere was still very tense in the aftermath of the assassination. White school children had stood up and cheered when the President's death was announced and bumper stickers which read "Kill the Kennedys" were still displayed on cars. This was no time for a Northern Black man to be walking around Montgomery. To prevent my having to do so, most of the people I wanted to interview insisted on coming to me, another example of the tremendous in-group loyalty and protection which black people have had to develop.

By assuming life styles which hid from white people their true feelings of anguish and hate, by employing an assortment of coping mechanisms to protect themselves from predators, Black Americans have been able to survive in the pit.

But there comes a time in the history of all people when, as Dr. King stated so eloquently, "(They) get tired of being trampled over by the iron feet of oppression." They despair of having to bow and scrape and lick their wounds. It does not matter whether they are Roman slaves or Africans, or Czechoslovaks, men want to be free, even if the price of that freedom is death.

In the minds of most Black people and of some white people there was no doubt that at some point Black people would begin to rise up and lash out at the oppressive white society. It has finally occurred. Following the Watts conflagration of 1965, distinguished Black psychologist Kenneth Clark wrote an article for the New York Times Magazine entitled "The Wonder Is There Have Been So Few Riots." The number is no longer a few. According to the Kerner Commission Report, in the summer of 1967 violent rebellions by Black people, and in a few instances Puerto Ricans, occurred in nearly 150 cities. The giant has awakened; his power has been unleashed, and apparently there will be no compromising over justice.

The real turning point in Black-White relations came in 1967, that hottest of all American summers, when Black people in Newark and Detroit responded to police provocation by attempting to burn those cities down. It should be noted that the Kerner Commission reported that in many of the violent outbreaks it studied, a precipitating factor was police interaction with Black citizens.

During that summer, concurrent with widespread violent revolt, there also occurred a cultural revolt accelerating the feelings of Black consciousness and Black self-determination. Dashikis, Tikis and Afro-hairstyles were cropping up over all the Black ghettos. "I am myself, I am beautiful, and I am descended from beautiful people" was at first a whisper, then a shout. And James Brown sold another million records: "Say It Loud, I'm Black and I'm Proud." The pendulum swung away from integration to Black separatism. "Why integrate with a sinking ship?" Malcolm X had asked. Now in the summer flames, many of Malcolm's questions and statements were beginning to make sense to numbers of Black people, some of whom had been fooled by a white press that had attempted to depict the former Muslim minister as a violent halfwit. Malcolm's appeals for a tri-partite program of Black economic, political, and cultural development began to take hold by the summer of 1967. Black Summer, 1967, changed all Americans' lives.

I remember addressing several groups of teachers and administrators just before the opening of school in the fall of 1967. I told them that they had better prepare themselves for a new group of Black pupils that they had never seen before. I told them that a new Black pupil had been born in the ashes of Newark and Detroit. He would ask questions never asked before. He would make demands never heard before. He would behave in ways never contemplated before. It required little wisdom to predict these changes, and I think it not immodest to say that they all came to pass.

By late September, 1967, Black students were demanding "Black Curriculum," one which would recognize their existence, would teach them their history, would celebrate their humanity, and would assist them to create a new and better life.

Black students were also demanding more Black teachers and administrators. But Black or White, the students demanded that teachers teach and stop copping out with excuses of cultural deprivation, large class sizes, and inadequate resources. Teach or leave, they said. In integrated schools, Black students added to the demands for curricular and personnel changes, demands that they be represented in such lily-white organizations as cheering squads and king and queen courts.

The fervor spread from school to school and from city to city as Black pupils boycotted classes and athletic teams and disrupted school activities. The movement was contagious. Before the year's end Puerto Ricans in Chicago and New York City and Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles and various Texas communities had joined in the movement to demand teachers and administrators of their own cultural groups and curricular modifications that reflect their ethnicity. Even groups of American Indians, long the oppressed, dispossessed Americans, began to chant "Red Power."

It was inevitable that the students of El Barrio and the Reservation would join their Black brothers in a common cause of justice in the schools and, larger, justice in the society. The giant has awakened and he is multiracial: Black, brown, red, and yellow. His strength grows, and he is fiercely determined.

At the same time the young students were asserting themselves in the schools, their older brothers were preparing to make their stand against the brutality of the vaunted, hated police. One organization, the Black Panthers, had gained considerable strength in the Bay Area and Chapters of the Panthers were beginning to proliferate throughout urban Black ghettos. The Panthers were a logical development in a social order where nobody else would protect heretofore helpless people from the police.

A whole host of activities during 1967-68 year seemed to suggest that at least some Black people were willing to engage in direct, mortal combat with the police. The Cleveland incident last summer is the most vivid example of a new kind of aggressiveness in the ghetto. There is no doubt, the Brother has changed. The days of docility, obsequiousness, and apathy are gone. They are replaced with anger, vigor, and an obsession to be self-determining -- to be free.

Nowadays as Black people walk the streets of Harlem, Watts, the Southside, they sense that something miraculous is happening. A kind of electricity is passing back and forth, charging and recharging feelings of "we can do it; we will make it; got to make it."

There are still group psychological problems, residuals of three hundred and fifty years of a racist "Black is worthless" dictum, but the shoulders are straighter and the children grow taller and prouder. They know with Leroi Jones that they are "Lovers and the Sons of Lovers." They know that they are the young warriors of a new nation and must be so accorded.

The schools found themselves incapable of coping with yesterday's lethargic child; today's proud warrior is totally incomprehensible to the white people who still have a stranglehold on education in Black America -- from Headstart to graduate school, to all the institutions in the ghetto.

It may be generations, if ever, before white people will comprehend the battle for peoplehood that Afro-Americans are waging in the schools and in the society at large.

Little Black Sambo and Aunt Jemima may be useful stereotypes for many white Americans, but Black people no longer intend to permit teachers or materials in their schools which will continue to destroy the hearts and minds of their children. About the only way that Black people can significantly influence curriculum and instruction in their schools is to take control of those schools.

As Fred Hechinger wrote several weeks ago in the New York Times, 'Black people in Ocean-Hill Brownsville and I. S. 201 will eventually win the battle for community control of schools, but the price will be anguish and bitterness, and possibly irreparable damage to Black-White relations." So be it. Apparently, there is no other way; apparently, white people, left to their own decisions, would continue to dominate the education of Black children.

Last year I spoke before teachers' and administrators' groups throughout the nation, and invariably white teachers, in a moment of genuine confusion and ambivalence about their own feelings, would say to me with great emotion, "Yes, I agree with you that Black children need to be reinforced and filled with racial pride, but how can I say 'Black is beautiful,' when white is beautiful?"

Therein is a substantial portion of the reason Black people are demanding control of their schools. White people have been nurtured and educated in a milieu of cultural arrogance that does not allow for the equal beauty of a pluralistic society. They must work themselves out of that monistic, often racist position. However, Black children have no more lives to waste waiting for white reconstruction. This is not to say that white people cannot or should not work in the ghetto; sheer mathematics would make that an imprudent assertion. What it does mean is that for the good of us all, white people are going to have to share the American pie and give up control over Black lives.

When the schools do change -- and they will, no matter who is assigned to teach in and administer the Black schools -- the children must have love and belief, and patience, and positive self-fulfilling prophecies. They must be told the truth about themselves and their country, and they must be encouraged to stand up and fight, and if need be, die, for what they believe is just.

Let me close this address on a personal note. As most of you must, I, too, get very weary and at times almost lose hope. Last April as I marched in the funeral cortege in Atlanta, I wondered if anything had any meaning anymore.

Recently, I had occasion to remember a very bright little boy who as a freshman in my high school English class, many years ago in the Chicago inner city, wrote an essay that was published in the National High School Essay Anthology. This is a part of what he said:

> "When God created man, He modeled man after Himself. He did not divide his creatures into classes. He made us all equal. The only real difference between men is the color of their skin; underneath they're all the same."

When this brilliant, sensitive boy graduated from high school and received a scholarship to an Ivy League College, I wrote to him expressing my great pride in his accomplishments but also my hope that he would never forget that he is Black and that Black people need his tremendous talents.

His achievements at college have convinced me that I never should have worried. He is the leader of the Afro-American Society on campus and the director of a special program for poor Black, Mexican, and Puerto Rican boys. On Christmas Eve I learned that he has been named a Rhodes Scholar. There is still much hope.

Response to Donald H. Smith

Monsignor Robert Fox
New York City

I think Mr. Smith's talk really needs no comment on my part. I would like to consider it as a point of departure from which to begin discussing what the implications of his talk are for us, at least for the majority of us here, who are white and middle class and who either directly or indirectly have a relationship with the inner city and the black and other minority communities.

I think the first implication is that we are challenged at this point in time to come to a posture which asks us to name life and name ourselves in the process, rather than labeling life and living with labels for ourselves.

In order to explain what I mean by that, I would like to tell you a little bit about this word that you probably don't understand -- if you do I'd appreciate talking to you afterwards, because we don't understand it --, the word that precedes my name, Monsignor. In this age, when everybody is looking into words and trying to find out what they mean or meant, in the Church, there have been various research commissions trying to find out some possible meaning of the word Monsignor; they've all failed. But I had an experience which gave me an indication of what the word might mean, a possible job description for Monsignors. I was driving down the Harlem River Drive one rainy Sunday night, and I had my raincoat buttoned up. As I was coming down the Drive I noticed that it was all jammed up, and I decided to take an alternate route, which is Second Avenue. So I got off the Drive about 128th Street and I didn't see the stop sign. I went through it and got on to Second Avenue. Second Avenue has progressive lights, and I was all the way down to 110th Street before I realized that somebody wanted to talk to me, somebody who was very boisterous and vulgar in his overtones, with big red glaring lights and a siren. Well, this cop pulled up alongside and said to me in a very gruff voice, "Get over there." So I pulled over and he pulled over behind me, and he came up to my car window and said, "Give me your license and registration." Well, I gave him my registration because I didn't have my license with me. I wasn't very honest about it either: I began to look in my pockets, the sun visors, and the glove compartment. But this man had a lot of endurance, so I finally had to say to him, kind of sheepishly, "I'm sorry, I don't have my license," which put an edge on his discomfort. He grabbed down at me and said, "Well, what do you do for a living?" And I said, "I'm a priest." Well, all my principles tell me it shouldn't be this way, but in the existential situation I was very happy to see his whole attitude change. He said, "Oh Father," and looked at the registration stub. The girl in the office had typed out the application; she had everything on it; she had "Vy. Rev. Msgr. Robert J. Fox." This cop stared down at me. He said, "Well, Father, what does this mean: Very Reverend Messenger?"

The word Monsignor means many things to many different people. It's kind of a label; so many different characteristics fall into place -- you're supposed to be old if you're a Monsignor, and a bureaucrat, and part of the establishment, and have a lot of power. Even in my own family it's an embarrassment; I've been trying for the last three years to get my father to stop calling me Monsignor Fox. It means something to him and it creates a funny feeling within me because there is no meaning to the word; it's as if IBM suddenly decided to name some of its people "Duke." There is no meaning in the title "Monsignor," no jurisdictional meaning, no meaning whatsoever; and yet, it's a word which we allow to work within our minds to create characteristics about people. That's what I mean by labels.

To go to another label, and to get to the subject of this morning's session with you -- "city street" is a label in many people's minds. What characteristics kind of fall into place immediately when people hear "city street?" They hear "dangerous," "unlivable," and people who like long labels that go all the way around the can say, "Work hard and get out of there because you can't live there." And, yet, the fact of the matter is, this is not true of streets. We saw in Don's paper the tremendous vitality and challenge that a city street represents for anybody living there -- a challenge in the sense that there are negatives and problems to be faced; but a challenge also in the sense that there are positive things and beauty there for the man who can bear to allow himself to respect the street enough to be willing to name it and to respect himself enough to be willing to name himself in the process. If it's true that suburbanites and people that live out of the city have this label for the city street, it's also true that many people in the city have the same kind of label for a city street. Oh yes, the people of the city street are warm and outgoing and sing in their bathrooms in their little apartments; but very frequently as people go from that apartment out into the corridor and down the stairs and out into the street, they assume a kind of a closed off, tuned out, invulnerable posture, so that nothing in the street is really going to touch them.

Now, if the people in the inner city desperately need the street, if there's going to be any education, any life, any vitality on their part, it's also true that all America needs the same city street, because there isn't any issue or reality or experience that we can come in touch with in Harlem or East Harlem or the South Bronx on the streets of that city that isn't facing all America. The difficulty, of course, is that America has so many filters and so many effective non-physical narcotics that America is not in touch with itself in the graphic, coarse, raw way that a city street can put a man in touch with himself. And so, while we constantly think of how we are going to educate the "disadvantaged," and while we're constantly thinking of models and programs and so forth to make what we have available to the people in the inner city, the fact of the matter is that it's our education that's at stake, as well as theirs.

Take the problem of alienation, which is so much written about and talked about; so many people think that it's the problem of the poor and think that it means that they are cut off from the middle and upper classes. Well, that's not the problem of the poor; if anything, that's their potential advantage, that they're cut off from the mainstream. And I, for one, would be appalled to think that the whole thrust of our effort in working with people in the inner city was to get them into the mainstream of American life. Because alienation is something proper to our society: it is the proper result of living with our value system. Yes, it's something observable among the poor; but they in this, as in everything, are simply graphic reflections of ourselves.

What is this problem of alienation? Well, it comes about more or less in this way: you wake up in the morning and pull up the shade and look out at the street and what do you see? You see garbage, a gutted building, a few narcotics addicts, a prostitute, and a cop taking graft on the corner. Your immediate temptation is to pull the shade down on all of that, because we really do believe, despite all of our theories about education, that what we don't know won't hurt us. And so, pulling down the shade and shutting it all out reduces the pain, and we think that we are better off for that.

But of course the problem is, once we pull the shade down on all of it, it just gets worse. If we pull the shade down on it, we are pulling the shade down on ourselves, because the only way that we have of being in touch with ourselves in an unfolding, live way, is as a result of looking at, listening to, touching, tasting, feeling, and experiencing that which is before us. And if it all becomes too ambiguous or painful or contradictory and we decide to shut it out, then we are numbing ourselves to ourselves and we are becoming alienated. At this very moment, for instance, for me to be alive to me requires that I look into your eyes, that I somehow try to read what you're saying to me; and I don't know what you're saying to me. So it's painful to discover myself at this moment in the relationship with you as you look at me and communicate with me nonverbally. It would be far more convenient for me to have a printed, canned message that I had prepared at another place and at another time and read to you or recited to you while looking at the ceiling or the ground, or looking at someone at the back of the room so that I wouldn't have to be in touch with what you are telling me. It's painful; but to the extent that in order to avoid that pain and that challenge, I go through mechanisms to shut you out from me, I alienate myself; and this is what is happening all the time.

Now, people think of alienation in the inner city -- on the streets of Harlem and East Harlem and so forth. But let's take another street in New York City and see the tremendous analogy: let's take Wall Street. You could walk up and down Wall Street for five months and never see egg shells or orange peels or empty beer cans or that kind of garbage, and yet there is so much garbage on Wall Street. There is more garbage on Wall Street on any day of the week than in Harlem and East Harlem put together: shady deals and unjust contracts that wreak havoc in the lives of millions of people all over the world; respectable men impeccably dressed walking into that street every morning, wallowing around in that kind of garbage every day for seven hours, vaguely aware of it in the back of their minds but afraid to be vulnerable to it, afraid to let it touch them; so they are alienated men. Or Sixth Avenue, where ABC and CBS and NBC have their empires and men with masters' degrees and doctorates in creative expression, who came to these buildings many years ago with some commitment to beauty and truth and the projection of it: for many years these men have been wallowing in the garbage of what we call the "boob tube," vaguely aware of it again in the back of their minds, but effectively making themselves numb or alienated to that piece of reality; so they are alienated men. Or the suburbs, where people are numb to the grass and the trees and the flowers, or the family across the street which has six boisterous kids who disturb the peace; suburbanites are alienated, too.

We continually generate this process of alienation in our society because of the value system that we live with: in our society we believe that love isn't cheap, and we're proud of that; and respectability doesn't come easily. If a man is going to be respected and loved and accepted, then he has to earn for himself the characteristics and criteria that make him acceptable and lovable. All of our government educational stimuli that we see in our inner city consist of big signs up on the walls saying, "Become somebody. Go to our schools. Get our credits. Get our kinds of jobs, and then you'll be somebody." This is such nonsense. If who I am depends upon my shaping myself to your criteria so that you can love me, this means that I have to live an alienated life, that I have to do violence to life: I have to shape it and box it and make it what I need it to be in order to give me the credits that make me acceptable.

That's the process of alienation that is going on in our country at this particular point in time in every sector of our society. "The disadvantaged" or "the poor," or whatever other word people are going to use for them, manifest in clear, concrete, and graphic ways what's going on throughout the country. America needs that street: the educational institutions and the churches and social agencies desperately need to be in touch with the challenge that the streets in the city present to us. And I fear that we are never going to be in touch with it at all, because we don't understand that we are the educatees, that we are the students: that if we have something to offer, it is as teachers respecting the "teacher" [i.e., the neighborhood] and the students who are ours; it is as teachers taught to look at the neighborhood not in terms of how many policemen we need to get from the subway station to the school where we teach, but in terms which have been learned by walking through those streets on our toes with our eyes wide open and our ears wide open, in terms of our having become vulnerable as persons to the reality that we pass as we go through that neighborhood.

By the very fact that we take children into schools, we are indicating that we feel that they can be potentially in touch with education. But we have to come to understand that their school is that neighborhood. If we are so up tight and turned off and fearful and invulnerable as we walk through the reality which is their school, how can we ever expect to be in touch with them? How can we ever expect to stimulate them to be more in touch, affectively and cognitively, with the school which is theirs -- namely that neighborhood, that street, those buildings and all the reality that is to be found where they are living?

Of course, we cannot do what I'm suggesting has to be done. Unless a man is developing his capacity to express what he is seeing as he looks at the street, unless he is developing his capacity to express who he is becoming as a result of looking at the street, he cannot continue to look at the street. If we are looking at the street every day without filters and listening to it and touching it and striving to be connected with it, the street as often as not is going to ask us to cry. But if we live as we do with that image of the fantasized "man on top of the situation" who cannot possibly afford to cry, and so we cannot bring ourselves to cry, well, then we have no option other than to shut out that piece of reality that would have us cry.

The street, if we are looking at it every day, will ask us to dance as often as it asks us to cry; and it is very difficult for Americans to dance. (I'm not talking about a formal ball with tickets and the right kind of dress and the right kind of steps; I'm talking about Zorba dancing.) If we were in touch with the inner city street, we would find so much to dance about; if we can afford to come in touch with ourselves in that exhilarating way and believe in ourselves as people so that we can thoroughly enter into joy, the street will frequently bring us to dancing. But again, if tripping over our own feet and making a fool of ourselves and being vulnerable is something that we can't bear to experience within ourselves, well, then, we can't dance this way. And not being able to dance this way, we cannot afford to be in touch with the street that would bring us to dance.

The street frequently asks people to taste themselves as frustrated and failing -- in our society the one mortal sin that everybody agrees upon is failure. We do such violence to life and to people around us and to ourselves and our principles and our ideals and everything else, that once we see the mere possibility of failure on the horizon, we feel completely justified in turning right or turning left or doing anything to avoid that failure at the end of the street.

Well, the people who are living in the streets have to live with failure. They might not be conscious of the fact; but a man really can't be a man unless somehow or another he has come to be able to digest failure and celebrate himself even as a failure. Existentially so many of the people in the streets are able to continue their commitment to who they are and their principles and all the rest of it, even when failure is popping up with such great frequency. America needs to learn that process of digestion.

And so it is with every possible human experience, from frustration to failure, to crying, to sweating. The street will make you frequently afraid; but in our society to be afraid is not respectable, because if we are really afraid we begin to sweat, and we're so fearful of sweating that there's a major industry in our country that gives us all kinds of things to put on so that in case we have to sweat, nobody else will know about it. And the sweat industry is just a symbol of many other things. We are afraid to be alive; we so need to live with the static image of ourselves to which we're addicted, that we're willing to do violence to whole segments of ourselves in order to be able to continue to live with that fantasized image of ourselves. It is so difficult for us to be expressive that we embrace the alienation which shuts out life and removes us from the challenge of "being who I am."

I'd like to give an example: the city streets of New York, and every other city, have some very interesting sewer tops. Sewer tops are very important in our program because they are a way into the street. Can you imagine what happens if we take a piece of cheap butcher paper and put it over a sewer top and then with charcoal or crayon do a rubbing over it, like we used to do over a Lincoln penny? The whole image comes through -- the circles, the triangles, the big rim, "New York City Department of Water Works, 1916;" the whole thing comes through that piece of paper. And all of a sudden this object, through which people should be discovering themselves but which has been taken for granted for ten or twenty years, is there in a new way: "I am relating to it, I'm there in a new way, and I've discovered a new piece of myself."

If people begin to look at sewer tops, the next thing they begin to look at is the buildings in the street, and maybe they begin to see the tenement buildings and the curlicues and the cement designs on the sides of the buildings and the fire escapes. And then, because our tolerance for looking at and being in touch with is growing, maybe we can see the five or six people sitting on a stoop on a summer's night drinking beer and talking to one another, and we can see the beauty and significance of that. And again, because our tolerance to look at and respond to is growing, then maybe we can see the garbage or the pusher or the cop taking graft and not just "close off" to it; maybe we can let ourselves think about it; maybe we can come to the point of acting upon it.

Well, these two principles or processes -- looking at reality and responding to it as a person -- seem to me to be at the heart of what education is all about. And yet, neither one of them is possible for a man except as he finds himself doing it in relationship to other persons. Because the things, the events, the issues, the problems suggested by Don Smith are the materials through which people mediate their relationships with one another in the process of their development and education. If there is a resistance to your writing in my flesh a revelation of who you are and my writing in your flesh a revelation of who I am, if all that is too painful and threatening for us, then there is no possibility of our coming in touch with the issues and events and problems that we can be working on together.

When I say "relationship," I mean it in a very special way. I mean it in the context of compassion, which is not pity as we are often tempted to think, but rather compassion in the strictest sense of the word, going back to its Latin roots, com-passion, which means to experience with or to experience in. Rather than making you "other," I allow myself to experience myself in you; there comes to be then a basis for our relationship with each other and the possibility of that relationship's continuing to be mediated by the reality before us.

But there is nothing that's more difficult to discern in our national life at this time than this kind of quality; we do just the reverse. The summer before last, Newark and Detroit blew up, and everybody had on their television sets pictures of the riots and the tanks and the fire and the helmeted policemen. And America looked at all of that and, characteristically, was not at all compassionate. The response that America came up with to that reality broke into two different kinds of responses, apparently quite distinct from one another and yet very much the same. The Conservatives said, "We've got to contain these people's violence; we've got to get out the National Guard and the Federal troops and the city policemen and get the mace and dogs and helmets and guns to put the lid on these people's violence." The Liberals said, "No, that's archaic. We've got to get money; we've got to get social workers and educators, and we've got to get them into these neighborhoods to solve these people's problems so that we can diminish these people's violence." In both cases they were saying, "*these people's* violence." Very few, if any, Americans looked at that violence in Detroit and Newark and said, "My God are *we* violent!" Very few people made the connection between that kind of violence and the kind of violence of which our society reeks.

Sure there's violence in the inner city, nobody's going to fantasize about that, but when there's violence in the inner city there's a body, there's a knife, there's blood, it stinks, you can take a picture of it -- it's right out there. Is there any connection between that kind of violence and the kind of violence that goes on in our respectable ivy-covered educational institutions of higher learning, where very respectable, gentlemanly, learned men spend at least part of their time undermining and undercutting one another in pursuit of the desired chair? Is there any connection between the kind of violence which occured in Detroit and violence like that in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf* that is rampant in our suburbs, where husbands and wives are not smashing one another in the face and drawing blood, but are dealing in psychological knives which effectively destroy another person? Is there any connection between one and the other?

Lawlessness: Americans were indignant and shocked that there should be lawlessness in our society. They saw looters coming out of stores with cases of beer and clothing and food, and they said, "Shoot those niggers; they're lawless; they're going to undermine our whole society." But did anybody make any kind of connection between that lawlessness and the lawlessness that's rampant in every sector of our society? You might have read a month or two ago about fourteen of the most respectable publishers in the United States who were caught price fixing over a period of five years. A few years ago, the New York papers reported -- and this sort of story breaks every day -- that three milk companies were caught price fixing. They had fleeced New York out of millions of dollars. When the corporations finally came to trial, a fifty-million-dollar corporation was fined five thousand dollars, and the corporate officers went home that night as respectable as when they left their homes that morning. Nobody said, "Shoot those guys, they're undermining our whole society." Is there any connection between that kind of lawlessness and the looting that we get so shocked about?

In the Church we have a law that says no one can charge admission to churches; and yet, in many churches they lock off all the entrances except the main entrance and put a big man behind a little table: anybody who gets beyond that table without putting their quarter down knows that they got by with something. If anyone said to the pastor of that church, "You're a looter," he'd say, "What do you mean, I'm a looter?" Or we've got people who work in bakeries who come home at night with a dozen rolls and two cakes under their arms; if anyone stopped them in the street and said, "You're a looter," they'd say, "What do you mean? Everybody does this; I work in that store."

Sometimes we find ourselves on the street getting to some of the more sensational revelations of poverty and incompleteness that are available in the inner city. Sometimes I am working in the street there and a group of tourists will come though, possibly students; as they walk down the street -- kind of in this zoo that they look at very strangely, as though it had no connection with their lives -- their guide or their teacher stops them and says, "See that lady, that lady in the third doorway? She's a prostitute." And everybody says, "Wow, a real live prostitute." Some people say, "Well, gee, should we get a cop and put her in jail? She's a detriment to this society." Other people say, "No, not a cop, get a social worker; refer her to a social worker and she'll solve her problem." Other people like to be religious and so they say, "There but for the grace of God go I."

The fact of the matter is there go I. Who's kidding whom? A week doesn't go by but that I don't prostitute myself a dozen times; I've strange ideas -- I've strange ideas about the Church and about this society, and about Vietnam, and about poverty and a host of other things. And I know so often when I find myself with my family or with my friends that these ideas are considered kookie, and that I am rejected if I express them.

And so, for the sake of "peace," I make myself what they need me to be, thus "buying" a little bit of belonging. And as this lady is selling her body for ten dollars, I am selling my mind and my convictions. The problem facing me, as I look at her in the street and she in a fleshy way reveals to me what prostitution means, is for me now to have the taste of myself-as-prostitute in my mouth. Let me experience the prostitute in me through her revelation of prostitution, and then let me talk about myself educating everybody; then let me talk about baptism, or circumcision. But no. Instead, I want to live with that fantasized self-image, where I'm the priest and I'm going to save her soul; I'm the educator and I'm going to move her into the mainstream; I'm the social worker and I'm going to solve her problem. I want to live with that little fantasized image of me rather than expose myself to what she represents.

And take narcotic addicts. There are now many programs for research and treatment; everybody's concerned about narcotic addicts. As I walk down the street and I see that guy learning up against the building with his head rolling around and his eyes rolling around in his head, looking like anything but a human being, the last thing in the world that I want to do is let him know the addict that I've made of myself through alienation. What I say instead is that I'm going to save him somehow or come up with some kind of a program to solve his problem. The fact of the matter is that he is putting me in touch with my real self. No, I don't use anything -- I've got clean wrists, and I don't smoke marijuana -- but, like you, I have a very effective bag of psychological tricks that I carry around with me everywhere, and I use them to coat my nerve endings so that I'm not in touch with what is embarrassing, or challenging or painful or shameful.

Of course, the other side of the coin is true: it's even harder to let myself experience the riches in me as revealed by another person. So often I stand with my back against a building and look out into a block party and see black people and Puerto Rican people dancing out in the middle of the street. It's an exhilarating thing; it's a total human experience that this man is having in dancing. I'd like to look at him and applaud him and pay him money and say, "Gee, that's terrific! Boy, these people can dance! That black culture! And the Puerto Rican rhythm! Of course, I couldn't do that; but these people!" Why couldn't I ever do that? I have arms; I have legs; I can move; what is it so important to me to make this man other and to resist the fact that he's putting me in touch with the riches that are within me? Why? Because it's so difficult for me to be vulnerable. I'd much rather live with that little piece of me and be invulnerable about it than let myself posit within me what I can discover in other people at the price of tripping over my own feet and looking like an elephant as I do it. Our society is so given to respectability and sophistication that there is such a fantastic gap between the ideas that we profess and the reality that's here.

It's difficult for us Americans to be in touch with ourselves as sinners (I don't mean that in the context it might seem because I wear a collar). A couple of years ago, at a meeting of the mayor's committee on religion and race, consisting of Rabbis and ministers and priests, somebody got really carried away and got up and pounded the table and said, "We've got to work toward the day when it's unthinkable that people practice discrimination and prejudice in this country." I said, "On the contrary, we've got to work toward the day when it's thinkable that people practice discrimination and prejudice. I mean, we reek of it; it's in our blood." But if I'm saying that because I've signed the given number of documents or I walked in Washington or I studied the right humanities course, and therefore think I've gotten beyond all that, well, then I'm going to continue to act in my prejudiced, discriminatory, alienated, numb way, and I'm going to rationalize my reasons for doing it. I'm going to say it's property values or law and order that I'm concerned with, not that I'm prejudiced. Or that it's my children's education that's the thing that really matters. We continue to do this kind of thing, and our educational institutions foster it. From the beginning of my experience as a child all the way through the seminary, the whole sense was "Show yourself as whole and we'll promote you; show us your completeness." And the fools who were vulnerable enough to be honest and to let themselves respond as human beings, and let the poverty in them show, were the people who were always in trouble.

If we are going to pick up where Don Smith left us, it seems to me that we have to embrace a radical vulnerability, that we have to come to understand that it's the extent to which a man lives that is our goal. If we are really going to be educating, we can measure the extent to which we are effective educators by looking at the extent to which we are being educated in the process. And if America today loses the opportunity that the poor and disenfranchised are presenting to it, I see little hope. But if America, challenged by these people, could seize upon reality -- whether it's in the suburbs or Wall Street or the inner city -- as that which can mediate a coming to be and an unfolding on our part, well, then perhaps there's hope.

Notes On Divisive Dichotomies

Jerome S. Bruner
Center for Cognitive Study
Harvard University

I have been struck, viewing the educational scene this past year, at the number of hardline dichotomies that have come to divide us. With your forbearance, let me use this opportunity to review some of them and to make some notes in passing about their possible significance and uses.

Let me begin with a list of the dichotomies that will occupy me, stating them in terms of oppositional contrasts to which the human mind, my linguist friends tell me, is so susceptible: Head vs. Heart; Head vs. Hands; Old vs. Young; Society vs. Individual; and Order vs. Innovation. Five dichotomies should suffice. If you suspect a dramatic plot, you may be right. For on one side we have, "An old head in a stable society seeking inherent order in events," and on the other, "A young heart seeking innovation in individual experience through action in its own manner and by its own means." The two are the principal members of the cast of characters to which we shall finally allude in considering where we may go.

Let me, before turning to the business at hand, go so far as to signal the conclusion to which I shall finally come. The conclusion is that, in education, we shall have to adopt the alternative of radicalism -- of abrupt change, of confrontation with entrenched practice, of disestablishment, of challenge to centralized authority, of emotionally painful reappraisal of the functions and role of culture. The revolution will not be staged by the young hearts against the old heads; my wager is squarely on a coalition of the two against the indifferent, the habitual, the so-called time-tested, and the timid. Before I am done, I hope to consider how one kind of commando operation can be manned and mounted to achieve these ends.

The dichotomies will help us into the task. Let us consider each of them in turn.

Head versus Heart

Wherever one goes these days, particularly if you happen to be the director of a center for cognitive studies, an educator is bound to ask you whether cognition is enough. Or, as on the dust jacket of Richard Jones' new book, *Fantasy and Feeling in Education* (a book in which I serve as the "heavy"), one encounters the blurb, "We are now at the point where we must go beyond exclusively cognitive education." The blurb writer is A. H. Maslow. He (and Professor Jones as well) remain sterlingly vague as to what this point is that we have reached that makes us now go beyond cognitive education, and why he thinks we should have waited this long.

Professor Jones seems to imply that great insights into the workings of human personality and motivation have brought us to this privileged pass.

Yet curiously enough, there is little that is new in these writings -- except for an exaggerated emphasis on subjectivity and inter-subjective relationships. With this exaggeration there is a corresponding silence on history and culture, on the nature of man's environment, and on what Freud with his flair for brevity called "the reality principle." The "new romanticism" places its principal stress on self-conscious subjectivity, the arousal of and cultivation of feeling. Each of us must start from the beginning, each making his own journey into the interior without maps, achieving his own identity and achieving a new honesty of feeling for himself and for those with whom he is in affective, immediate contact. In this perspective, culture as a continuity with what Durkheim nearly a century ago called "exteriority and constraint" fades away. So, too, history and the sense of tradition. It is in this sense that the journey into the interior is without maps: each person must do it on his own. All that is corporate, traditional, and formulated must first be weighed in terms of personal relevance and affective immediacy; if it cannot measure up as "your own thing, now" it has no place on the journey.

Whence this emphasis on immediacy and personalness? Perhaps it suggests some weary despair with the inherent complexity of knowing -- that knowing is on the one hand so closely kin to feeling and predilection, and on the other so bounded by its practical consequence in action. The pure act of knowing, if such can be imagined, is surely a disembodied thing; as Goethe warned, "Gray is all theory, Green grows the golden tree of life." But does one recapture fullness by emphasis on feeling and subjectivity, even in the spirit of a corrective? I think not.

Let me argue that one of the great inventions of a culture -- its myth, its drama, its art, its metaphor -- is precisely the artificing of means to contain within a single compass the reach of the heart and the range of the head. So, too, with the writing and rewriting of history, for history is not so much a record of the past as it is an accounting of how the continuing present could have come into being at all -- not just the contemporary present, but the metaphoric one. One does not create either art or history, drama or metaphor out of an exercise of "pure feeling" and unfettered spontaneity. Nor does one create deep satisfaction or realistic despair by exposing one's feelings to the categorization of psychological diagnosis. I do not believe that the "education of feelings" is brought to fruition by such rhetoric. I would urge that it is the aim of "affective education," if one must single out such an enterprise, to relate feeling and thought to action. In our time, indeed, feeling seems more likely to lead to talking -- endlessly. For the domain of "pure feeling" is so abstract that, in fact, it lends itself to little but speech. Ella Fitzgerald, with a somewhat more limited range of feeling in mind, put it with classic brevity: "If you're talking about it, you ain't doing it." And, indeed, one develops skill only by "doing it" -- skill in action and in thought, with relevance and passion.

None of what I have said will be taken, I hope, as a defense of "exclusively cognitive learning." Indeed I do not know exactly what critics have in mind when they use such an expression. I hope they do *not* mean the stuff of the formal recitation, the non-think of the memorized but uncomprehended formula, the reeling off of dates and places and cliches about their relevance. The root of the word "cognitive" is "to know" and such learning, as I have tried hard to say elsewhere -- the rote type of learning -- has little to do with knowing. Indeed, it has proved too long to be the enemy of knowing.

What was intended by the curriculum reformers was *not* dry stuff, *not* formalism, but a genuine arousal of interest in new materials and new skills by presenting these honestly, vividly, and in a fashion that would make the exercise of mind inherently rewarding. *Man: A Course of Study* -- one of the most recent examples in this tradition of curriculum designed for use by the fifth and sixth grades in elementary schools -- deals with the emergence of man and the sources of his humanity. In its very nature, it can be as readily taught in the fifth grade as to bright undergraduates or teacher trainees, and has been taught at all of these levels. It is a great and gripping course that fails in some interesting ways, too, and I mention it not only because I think it succeeds in *making it possible to blend the affective and cognitive*, but also because it is virtually impossible to avoid issues of this order by the very nature of the material presented. The course is fashioned precisely to produce such confrontations between head and heart. Even Professor Jones would admit that much. Where he demurs, I think, is in the fewness of explicit exercises for exploring the feelings aroused *as feelings*. This is a debatable point, and he has had a chance to have a hand in such debate and, indeed, in refashioning the course. I would only suggest the caution that we *not* embrace the goal of affective education as an end in itself. Let the head and heart work together as they will, not as prescribed in separateness.

But *I* am not satisfied with the new courses being offered for quite another reason, and to that we turn next in considering the dichotomy "Head versus Hand."

Head versus Hand

In most languages there is a quite well-drawn distinction between "knowing about" and "knowing how to." Even when the word "to know" is used ambiguously and without context -- as quite often happens in English -- we usually know what is intended. For it is a universal thing about linguistic distinctions that they have a marked and an unmarked side. Thus, with the word *nurse*, not otherwise specified or marked, the "meaning" is a woman nurse and one doesn't have to say anything further. We mark the word when something else is intended: male nurse, automatic nurse, etc. When a language uses a single word that contains a contrastive distinction (as with *to know* including the more instrumental as well as the more passive forms of knowing), the word used will have a marked and an unmarked version to help covertly with the listener's problem of what linguists call "disambiguation."

I suspect that as the division of labor within a society increases, there is more and more a tendency for the *unmarked* version of "know" to refer to passive knowledge. That is taken as the norm. *He knows airplanes* does not signify that he either knows how to build them, repair them, or fly them. There are a variety of similar examples in this class: *he knows music*, *he knows wine*, *he knows history*, *she knows men*, etc. The exception is in the form *he knows ---ing*, as with *He knows skiing*, even though that may be ambiguous, for one can also say, *He knows flying, and hopes to take some lessons some day*. We must, for full clarity, use a marker like "how to" in statements of this type: *he knows how to sail*, etc.

In less differentiated societies, I am led to believe that the unmarked version of *knowing* implies an instrumental or intimate knowledge and, indeed, it is sometimes complicated (as in the African language, Yoruba) to make clear that somebody merely knows about something without knowing how to do it. Knowledge, under such circumstances is assumed to be more active -- or at least one may so infer from the semantic marking system. Very likely, the same would hold for more homely use of language in a rural society, in contrast to an urban society where the same language is spoken. Thus, "*John knows cars*" in a rural setting would more likely imply that if yours is broken down, take it to John, whereas in the urban setting it would more likely imply an ability on John's part to match examples with trademarks.

In any case, I suspect that in school learning there has been a systematic de-emphasis upon carrying the learning process to the point of *knowing how to.* I mean this in two senses: knowing how to *produce* knowledge, and knowing how to *use* knowledge in some specific application. Students are *taught* history. This implies neither that they are capable of *writing* history from the sources, nor of applying any so-called "lessons of history." With respect to the former of these, there is a subtle but pronounced change occurring. The new mathematics curricula, placing so much more emphasis on intuition and generativeness in mathematical reasoning, sought (at least in initial intention) to make the learner into his own mathematician at however modest a level. So, too, the admirable new course *From Subject to Citizen* which supplies the student with the raw documents of the migration to American in the seventeenth century and then carries through in the same vein through the early Colonial and Revolutionary period to Mr. Chief Justice Marshall's court.

But as for the applied sense of *knowing how to use knowledge* we may have fallen victims to the idea that each man must work out that problem for himself -- which is surely true within limits, but not very broad limits. In the social sciences, where the application of knowledge to decision-making is sometimes referred to as the *policy sciences,* there is, I believe, a particular need to emphasize how to use knowledge for useful ends. In my university there has been a stormy, but in many ways effective, new course introduced on the subject of "radicalism" -- not the usual course on the history of radical movements (which is also an interesting subject) but one on *applied* radicalism as a policy science. Fanon, Marcuse, Che, and Mao are perhaps more closely examined than Max Weber, Marx, and John Locke, but it is for the closer concern of the former writers with the processes of radicalization and radical innovation. By the same token, the law student reads case law and Beale and Means on the corporation rather than or in addition to economists like Adam Smith, Schumpeter, or Keynes. There is a deep problem of application of relevant knowledge to the needs of social action that cannot be left to chance.

Let me urge that the key problem *from the start of schooling* is to keep joined the head, the heart and the hand -- a sense of what is worth struggling for, how one thinks about it, and how one achieves one's goals in a fashion that is neither self-defeating nor morally compromising. It is only through such an ambitious reconstruction of what we do in education that we can relate what the schools do to what life is about. And there is no such substitute, in a high-sounding rhetoric, that has to do with simply refining our sense of our own affective life. It's a question basically of how, somehow, the intelligence, the affect and action can be joined.

Let me illustrate with one of our own local enterprises at ESI-EDC. The television-assisted course for junior and senior high schools, *One Nation Indivisible*, dealt with the events that followed in the train of the murder of Martin Luther King. It was a short course designed to get students to discuss the significance of this ghastly event not only as a public crisis, but also as it had affected their personal feelings. Videotaped interviews with black and white students were used with great power. The chief thrust of the student discussion was *what to do* about the ghetto walls that existed internally in each person's mind, and externally in the society. Its objective was to reduce by whatever means one could, anywhere -- inside, outside, close or far -- the ravages of racial injustice. It was, by any standard of evaluation you wish to apply, a highly effective course (see the study by Whitla and Hanley). Note, please, that the issues to be acted upon were not only immediate and grave, but were in fact unsolved. This was no school debate. The course was a radical departure: it had as its aim the solution of a problem that had national, local, and personal significance -- a problem for which no answer existed, a *real* problem. These are the kinds of problems with which what I called "the policy sciences" are necessarily concerned.

There is no lack of such problems in the world today, alas -- personal, local, and national, indeed worldwide. It hardly seems justified to go through the well-known catalogue, yet let me remind you of some of the possible ones on the "school list" that might possibly organize the field: the relation of the sexes, the impact of technology on everyday life and the life of the community, the maintenance of order and the control of violence, the justification of warfare, the control of poverty, the control of population, the poisonous effect of racism, the separation of the generations, the meaning of work and of leisure, the significance of drugs, etc. Each has its history, its economics, its biology, its sociology; each can serve as a means of organizing areas of knowledge in a fashion which does not have to arouse artificial affect, and does not have to arouse the mind to its own rational activity with no good in view.

Surely these provide themes for converting much intellectual discussion from the "purely cognitive" or "purely affective" sphere into a frame of reference that relates both the head and the heart to the act. It is this that converts trafficking in knowledge from mere consumption to a more satisfying production. If the response from the academy is that knowledge is not presently organized around such issues, then please remind us in the academy that survival may have to take precedence over department lines. We have been reminded before and done well by the society.

Old versus Young

In the event you cannot see me plainly or are deceived by appearance, I am over thirty. In not many years I shall be twice that. That puts me in the interesting position of having to think about successors during the coming decades. There is a Russian proverb, "Do not envy my gray hairs;" for my part, I do not envy my successors. There is an enormously complicated half-century ahead in which individual options will increase, but in which our capacity for managing the society may decline because of the pressure of numbers and the obscuring effects that make novelty seem at the outset like complexity.

I am, I must confess, bored with the topic of "old versus young," for it is a perpetual chestnut that hides the deeper questions of apprenticeship, mastery, and what is required to take over the enterprise -- or to change "it," replace "it," or even do away with "it." Whatever "it" is, it most certainly requires managing. There is a procedural structure involved in using power justly, in distributing goods equitably, and in setting priorities. The skills and professions involved in carrying out the social enterprise of the coming years are varied almost beyond present comprehension, and we are in the midst of inventing new occupations and enterprises for dealing with them -- think-tank gadflies, systems analysts, computer graphic display technicians, economic generalists, media specialists, ad infinitum -- and we haven't even touched the inventive processes of putting together new professions. We are endlessly fond of quoting a lesson that we claim to have learned: better to educate rather than to run a trade school where people are shaped to fill particular jobs. General education and knowledge predisposes to mastery of more specialized skills.

But, what is not clear is what this general education should be for this new era, when it should start, and what the generic skills are that most readily predispose one later to the acquisition of more specialized skills. Nor is it plain what the range of specialized skills are that are needed and, moreover, whether the need for them signals itself back into the school systems. These are obscurities. Man's environment has changed in a crucial way since the Industrial Revolution -- at first slowly, then with increasing speed. Increasingly, our problems with the environment are not with the natural environment, but with the man-made environment. To our peril, we have begun to cure the ills of the former by creating the latter. Yet, the cure may be worse than the illness. The isolation of rural and pastoral existence may be alleviated by the invention of the city, but the city may kill us harder yet. In any case, the threat of this mainly uncontrolled progress may have undermined many of the most cherished assumptions on which our communal life was based. If this is even partly true (and it surely must be) then it becomes mandatory that we reconsider what kind of general education is likely to enable the future generation to develop needed skills for the new contingencies of the future. I have suggested more emphasis on "how to" rather than on "what," since I believe that such an attitude more likely leads in human affairs to trouble recognition and to problem finding. But there are many other changes that are needed as well to cope with these new conditions.

Now let me return to the dichotomy: old versus young. How may we assure that there is appropriate training or apprenticeship available in a "takeover" generation such as the present one? It does not appear that the times will wait for a new philosophy of succession to be worked out in advance. The demand of youth is for a better share in the protocol of the present. We may infer this not only from the crises at Nanterre, at Tokyo, at Berkeley, but from dozens of less dramatic situations where procedures are forging a philosophy of succession. Yet curiously, the precipitating issues in most of these confrontations have *not* been educational in any substantive sense, but socio-political, even though sometimes cloaked in academic vestments (as with the demand for autonomous departments of Afro-American Studies, which are rarely needed, but which represent the tip of the iceberg of many other forms of social and political discontent). The rhetoric of student radicalism shows very little awareness of education itself. It centers on the *governing* of the university and not upon its *substance*. And, that alas, is not a very inspired subject, nor likely to be made so unless coupled with some goals regarding the use to which education is to be put.

In that domain, alas, we have little save a certain anti-establishment line about relevance and feeling and conviction, usually quite empty, as if the University should become a forum for discussion. If anything, the academic line that goes with the idea of social radicalism is in favor of the "affective education," which I found a moment ago to be insufficiently radical for our times.

Yet I want to return again to the Harvard course on radicalism. It is one of our few courses in Arts and Sciences that is specifically given over to issues of action and policy as related to social decision of a kind that forces us into action. It is a course in problem solving as well as problem finding. It takes the needed radical step on the instructional side: the sharp conversion of instruction to the service of policy and action. Cannot early instruction in government, economics, sociology, urban studies, public health, etc., be similarly organized in the form of "policy sciences"? Cannot students work from the start like members of policy-planning staffs, or members of "think-tank" groups? Let the problems be ones *not* yet solved, and let the exercises provide opportunity to plan and (if so it should work out) to execute appropriate action. Would not curriculum find a place closer to life in such a dispensation? This need not be the whole of the curriculum, but it would give a life to the curriculum -- a promise of head, heart, and hands working in concert. I am convinced that as far as the elementary school is concerned, particularly in the social sciences, this is the way and the only way. I believe that we must explore first the problems, the deep troubles, the goals for action. Then let there be an exploration in terms of the structure of knowledge -- but with the issues already encountered, however dimly understood.

You will wonder whether I am linking knowledge too closely and too soon with action. I hope I am not. Rather, it is a corrective. We have separated them too sharply -- particularly in the social and behavioral sciences. But there is still a more powerful justification to be given that relates to the nature of early learning. Elsewhere I have spoken of the way in which knowledge is organized, noting that one can distinguish enactive, iconic, and symbolic modes of knowing in terms of how to do, in terms of how to picture, and in terms of how to put it into words and symbols. To this can surely be added a fourth mode of representation: the evaluative mode, knowing in terms of one's goals, one's aspirations, one's values. There was a famous cartoon of a very serious looking man in a gallery before a wall full of pictures, one bystander saying of him to another in awe, "He knows all about pictures, but he doesn't know what he likes." It would seem to me that one of the great problems in a rapidly changing culture is precisely to assure that the skills of its members in mobilizing knowledge be made serviceable in behalf of what they care about, what they like.

I think it is an error to wait "until the child is ready for the action," whenever that may be. Let there be honest discussion of real problems and their unknown solutions from the start, and nobody would doubt that any child is capable of practically any action in some form. It would start with a host of embarrassments -- for example, with the issue of who gets what to eat and whether the kids of the friendly trashman have as much as they need. It would begin, also, with questions like whether some kids are warned that they will find nobody home when they get there, and why. There will be affect, all right, and there will be embarrassment galore; but not for its own sake. I am fully aware of how disturbing to the false facade of social living such an introduction to the policy sciences can be and how tabooed would be a "Show and Tell" on "What I have where I live." To face that problem, I must turn to the next dichotomy: individual versus society.

Individual versus Society

There has arisen a new way of talking about society as "the system" or "the establishment." From the elevated perspective of middle age, one is struck by what seems to be its voluntarism -- as if one could opt in or out of society by copping out, dropping out, turning off, turning on. What has alarmed the elders is the ways in which this voluntarism appears to be "acted out" -- going abroad to live, adapting styles of dress and living, getting on drugs, refusing to take a job, or entering upon a career of arduous anti-establishment or non-establishment service -- signalling ways of not being part of the establishment. It is principally the children of middle class families who are involved, and there is much murky ink expended in explaining how all this is the effect of the Bomb, the pill, affluence, population pressure, the decline of the family in urban society, Vietnam, etc.

I do not doubt that some or many of these ways of "copping out" are highly conventionalized and may not express anything very deep in the psyches of those engaged. What I would rather do is try to understand what it is that is legitimate and lasting in this stance of protest. I believe that the image of society that has emerged reflects a feeling on the part of the young that the society is not responsive, that in return for their efforts, too little happens and the world goes on in its blind, insensate, dangerous way under the same familiar figures going through the same familiar routines. Why try to find a peace in such a system? That is the question.

Opting out, of course, is not one of the options of the less advantaged, and the current generation of students knows this probably better than their elders. The society has already opted them out -- rendered them powerless. But it seems to me plain as day that what the young want (and what the ghetto wants as well) is to produce response in the society to a set of needs, to control it in some measure, to have some hand, as a student of mine once put it, "in the management of fate." What is so attractive in the endless talking at the Odeon in Paris during May, 1968, or wherever student protest has taken over a forum, is that such spontaneous doings are responsive and one has, at least for a while, the illusion of participation. But then it passes.

The idea of "containing" or "disciplining" such aspirations of a new generation is, I think, a poor rhetoric and misses a tremendous opportunity. I would suggest instead that we think in terms of how to put all this energy to work in its own behalf and in behalf of transforming the society, literally to revaluate the process of succession. We have argued from the beginning of the century about the inept transition our culture provides between adolescence and adulthood. Here at last is our opportunity to change it.

The first place to start, it seems to me, is in the vast interspace between the mythic world of spontaneous contemporaries on the one side, and the equally mythic world of the big system on the other side. Obviously, the most important part of that interspace is the school, which I should like to see under a far more localized control than is now the case. And with localized control (and please do not mistake my intent: I am not singling out for local control only ghetto schools, which in some ways have most to suffer from decentralization) there must also come a degree of self-government and local control by students that, in my view, is very possible, but very far away.

But it can start, and I should like to make a few suggestions about that. I would propose putting present curricula, organization, and lesson plans in competition (perhaps for two days of a five-day week) with the new procedures worked out by students with such teachers and older students as they are able to recruit for help. I would give them a hand in budget decisions, teacher evaluation, grading procedures, etc. Not all schools, not all classes within a school, not all students within a class would want a hand.* I would also suggest that special efforts be made to make available the full resources of the community -- its college, if it has one, its hospital, its doctors and lawyers and militants and union officials and politicians.

It is this last matter, the recruitment of the community's resources, that relates to going more deeply into the policy sciences. No two places will have the same kinds of "action," the same policy problems with people ready to take hold of them. No two places -- no two schools, no two classrooms, no two grades -- will have exactly the same forms of resistance from parents, teachers, and/or students. Far more important than uniformity is that there be a fitting honesty and relevance to the problems attacked and the ways of attacking them.

I am not so naive as to overlook the disorder, the squabbling, indeed the uproar that such a plan would produce. Nor do I think it can easily be started, no less brought off. But my guess is that a relatively small number of local starts would quickly grow into a large movement.

---

*My assistant, who is young, highly intelligent and "radicalized," challenged me as to what I meant by "giving students a hand." My reply was that if I knew, I would be dishonest to have said it vaguely. But none of us can possibly know a formula for the order of how many votes equal "a hand." My advice is to use the best procedures you have for getting a big hand, for the habit of the system will be to give you only a token.

Indeed, I believe that it might even be possible to train small commando teams in our schools of education to facilitate just such a radical alteration in our system of schooling and its supervision. I am trying to stir up some action myself. It is an experience full of detail: how to use teenage talent in teaching in the elementary grades on the problems of growing up in the society, how to get pediatricians to discuss pot honestly and without cant, how to get ghetto teachers and kids to take a hand in telling non-ghetto schools out in the suburbs what it is like and staying put to hear it back from the others, etc. There are all matters at which innovation teams can become very expert -- a bit like the "agitprop" groups in revolutionary societies. And that brings me to the final dichotomy, order versus innovation.

Order versus Innovation

I commented on the split curriculum: Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for the Establishment; Tuesday and Thursday for the Wild Men. There are certain forms of order, however, that I think are crucial, though hard to enforce. One of them is that in many forms of knowledge, one step must be taken before another can be undertaken. The prerequisite structure of knowledge is not rigid, but it most certainly is present. If there is to be innovation, there must be a compact on the training of certain key skills that are utterly crucial to the economy, and these must be "guaranteed." They are, on close inspection, as crucial as a man's personal freedom and his rights before the law.

They include very elementary things, and this is the place in which to say a word about them: language skills and reading, certain conceptual powers that can be stimulated by such formal disciplines as logic, mathematics, and operations with content-free notational systems, and so on. Let these matters be made very explicit, for not only must they be a strong part of the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday fare, but just as important, put into the Tuesday - Thursday exploration of the more policy-oriented fields and problem orientations.

Decision theory itself is a highly mathematical inquiry; it's quite fascinating. teaching children, for example, to set up payoff matrices in terms of what the chances of achieving something are, what the costs are; teaching them to think coolly about how they can control their own destinies. I can teach that kind of mathematics to fifth graders more readily than I can quadratic functions, and I'm not talking through my hat; I've tried. This technique of decision analysis can be used in conjunction with the solution of traffic and pollution and poverty problems, and I'd love to see these kids get hold of those and put those problems in this form. So too can the theory of myth analysis, developed by

Levi-Strauss, be used for exploring the structure of racial bigotry that divides us, and what a classical, ancient and dirty form it has.

But there are other things which, though strictly speaking they are not skills, are also essential and need a guarantee in the curriculum. These include a sense of power and control over the world that touches us directly. But such a feeling of power comes from a form of disciplined knowledge. There must also be models of the world to guarantee this disciplined knowledge: structures in the head that give one a sense of what man is about, what nature is about, what the forms of the human condition can be. These come, not only from the rational modes of knowing, from mathematics and science and so on, but from the left-handed illuminations of the myth maker and the poet, the player and -- in Joseph Campbell's beautiful phrase -- "The hero with a thousand faces," all kinds of heroes, each people with their own kind of hero.

I've said that we must move in social studies toward the policy sciences, but it would be perilous to exclude from the policy sciences their literary adjunct. Billy Budd and Oedipus Rex from the realm of drama also represent comments on policy problems. Not long ago, I read a piece in The Yale Review by Professor Charles A. Reich of Yale Law School on the exploration of the moral and legal dilemma of Captain Vere, Billy Budd and that nasty master of arms, Claggart, that makes such an extraordinary novel out of Melville's book (which, incidentally, was based upon episodes that were very real, just as real as Commander Bucher and the Pueblo are now). By my most radical students' opinions, I should not be concerned with these matters, because a belief in history and drama traps you in the old dilemmas. But nonetheless, I feel quite sure that one of the things that is needed to start off with is some classical filter through which to view the plight of man. You must have some way, if you are to approach the policy sciences with heart as well as head, to see them from a literary context. It's no accident, for example, that the American merchantman from which Billy Budd is captured in that fantastic novel is the Rights of Man out of Philadelphia. Melville had something in mind -- the very same things that one has in mind when one writes the laws and protects people.

In the end, I urge a working coalition of the concerned old heads and the young hearts against the indifference in the middle. There is a French proverb, "Les extremes se touchent," which means that different kinds of extremism have much in common. I'd like to have the extremes of these dichotomies in contact, even if at first one group thinks of themselves as the Monday, Wednesday, Friday Warriors and the other as the Tuesday, Thursday Rebels. In the end, they may find that they are better off sharing the whole week, even if they fight the whole way through.

Finally, I am aware of the problem of recruiting and training teachers. It is *the* great problem in education. We do *not* recruit our ablest people into education, indeed we do not even recruit a proportionate share of the ablest into education -- particularly elementary education where the turning off begins and is most often completed. And once into the system, it is no great pleasure. Supervision is poor and often regressive, the ablest people are often driven out by the static sense of getting nowhere in the work, the work itself is (I discovered trying to teach a fifth grade class a few years ago while on leave from Harvard) brutally difficult and tiring.

Let me say only one thing: the moment the educational system becomes a major arena for reconstruction in our society, a genuine locus for debate and innovation, the young will flock to it. They are full of the kind of zeal and airing that could make our schools sing. They might *even* work for the disgraceful wages now offered at least for a while.

Response to Jerome Bruner

Dr. Fanny Shaftel
Professor of Education
Stanford University

My first reaction, when Dr. Bruner started talking about head versus heart, was to agree with him. I felt that he can help us to see ways in which we can make "cognitive material" acceptable to children, so that the knowledge they acquire becomes their own knowledge, and not an artificial body of memorized information. I am delighted to hear Dr. Bruner say that we should start first with "problems" and "actions," and then draw upon knowledge appropriate to solving them. We seem to have come round a historical circle. And we're back to where "a person confronting a situation is the unit element of life and of education," to quote William Herd Kilpatrick. What we're asking is that children shall have a chance first to confront situations which are real for them; then with the help of skilled people, they can map out the search for the relevant information which will equip them to cope with the situation on their own terms and in the terms provided by their own ideas. This sort of search will preclude their having meaningless packaged solutions forced on them. We now have powerfully better ways of organizing the "cognitive" materials and making them available for such use.

However, I would like to quarrel with Dr. Bruner about head versus heart and to suggest that the area that the heart is concerned with is not at all ambiguous; from the very beginning of life a child is being inducted into a culture which teaches him a world view. What he accepts as real is screened through his anxieties, his past experience and his defense mechanisms. I've just gone through an incident that's like a Rashomon incident in which one person responds saying that she has been highly threatened by the words of another person and the other person responds by saying, "That's not what I meant at all." Whatever the knowledge is that we make available to children, that knowledge is still going to be screened through individual perceptions. I think that those individual perceptions have to be educated from early childhood onwards. Feelings are a part of the feedback from which we learn about children's perceptions.

Here is an example of what I mean: I have been showing a photograph, which was taken on the streets of Harlem, to a group of children; in it there is a policeman -- he happens to be white -- holding back a group of children. The children are about to cross the street and are waiting for the signal. Many children have very different interpretations of what is happening in that picture. This is why I think that it is necessary to educate simultaneously the affective and cognitive responses of children from an early age. They must learn to analyze their responses so that they can then use cognitive material in a more "rational" and "logical" fashion.

Ronald Lippet demonstrates this very well in his social science education materials. He starts with incidents which occur in the lives of children, incidents which are very real to them -- an encounter between a young person and an older one, for example -- and lets the children work through what they perceive in the incident. This then leads into a natural sequence of investigations: the children examine the many different perceptions that different children have; they are then able to see the many alternative lines of action that are available to them; they can look at similar incidents in the wider social scene; they can observe models of the kinds of behavior that were operating; and they can select what they regard as the most effective behavior patterns.

In this way, we relate the "affective" and the "cognitive" aspects of the personality. The child screens his experience, and it is this response which we must try to educate. We have to help the child to pull out of the unconscious the values he holds and the feelings he has that color his perceptions. These must be examined, looked at, talked about, argued about, and then modified -- not just at the affective level, but at the cognitive level.

Dr. Bruner: In the main, I agree. I find myself in the curious position of arguing the very classical doctrine that basically man's individual life is made up of three intertwined things having to do with action, feeling and thought.

One of the things that troubles me is that only in periods of curious contemplation do we ever somehow separate things entirely from the mode of action. And what bothers me, to put it as bluntly as I can, is that a preoccupation with affect as such, even the cognitive side of affect, without bearing in mind that it relates to some goals, some things that we want, is masturbatory. And I am much concerned with the business of the goals of life. It is only in a society where we have the illusion that things have somehow been laid out for us, and that the goals have already been set, that we become preoccupied with affect in that way, particularly in times like this. I see this as the great testing time of mankind; if we are to make it in the next half century, or if mankind is not to go through a period of very very grave decline, we ought to arise to the emergency by reconsidering always what the modes of action are.

Certainly, I would be the last person in the world to cast the least doubt on the importance of the filter of affect in the role of perception in that the person has to be put on his guard. We don't disagree there. I want us not to forget in our rather passive way of looking at "knowledge about," that there is also "knowledge how to," and one of the most important forms of "knowledge how to" today is, how in the world are we going to survive, given the things that divide us?

Dr. Shaftel: One of the points that Kenneth Boulding makes that impresses me tremendously is his differentiation between the folk culture, (i. e. the way in which people believe in traditional behavior patterns, just because they are traditional) and the super-culture that operates on the basis of what is rational, tested, and analyzed. It seems to me that the great task before us is to find a way of leading the people who have been raised on the folk culture, including ourselves, into the super-culture, and to solve the problems of society rationally, rather than on the basis of past recipes. In most of the problems we face today is the conflict of the two cultures; there are also other conflicts, such as vested interest of various sorts, which also block the way to using the super-culture in rational ways.

My main thesis is that I would like to be as systematic about the affective education of children as Dr. Bruner has been about the cognitive education of children. This means that as we watch the children responding with horror to, say, a film about the eskimos on their seal-hunting expedition, we have to help the children to relate what they are observing to the kinds of experiences they themselves have in their own lives. If you are talking about what it would be like to be hungry and not to have food, you would have to help the child to understand what deprivation really meant by relating it, perhaps, to something that he had experienced, so that he could internalize the unfamiliar experience of the eskimo and regard it as something about which he has to care a great deal. I would submit that unless we do this, we will have children who have a large stock of information, who are able to lay out marvelous strategies for playing the various games, and who become highly manipulative with that knowledge, rather than children who are committed to the kind of social problem-solving that Dr. Bruner is suggesting.

So, I would like to see a systematic way of exploring what Harold Isaacs called, "the scratches on the mind" -- the kinds of stereotypes, the kinds of heavily emotionally loaded attitudes that children bring to any study. I would like to see systematic ways of laying them out, of dissecting them, of helping children to understand their own feelings as they respond to specific material, and of modifying those feelings, helping children to move toward more rational ways of dealing with information.

If we are going to do this we have to deal very heavily with the people in the middle. One of the largest problems in American education today is the great white ghetto of the suburbs -- the people who have removed themselves and their children from the confrontation with real problems and the children who are learning to play "games" in their lives, in the same way that they play the "game" of school, in school.

I happen to deal with problem-solving situations through role-playing, and one of the experiences which shocked me was working with children from a well-to-do-suburb. We played out a situation based on the following question: "What do you do when your gang says you have got to pay your share and your father says, 'No, ' and then while you're delivering for the druggists, you're accidentally overpaid $10 instead of $5? Do you pay your gang first? Do you knock on the door and give the money back?" Although, we played it in hundreds of situations, the immediate answer was always, "First you pay your gang and then maybe you can work this out," or a fantasy solution: "You knock on the door and the man will say, 'You're an honest boy, keep the change.' "

We then discovered that, when the problem is too difficult, middle-class children have a remarkable way of replotting the problem or plotting away from it; we found that our skillful teachers were not even aware that the children were leading them away from the problem into something else. In one instance a boy said, "It's very easy; you tell your father you need a microscope. He'll give you money for that; then you pay your gang, and you borrow a friend's microscope to show your father."

I would suggest that no "cognitive material" would particularly help modify this situation. We have a job to do with the whole business of values, of pressures, of the kinds of priorities that are set for children by adults, of the priorities that they set for themselves in the survival process, and of the kinds of interractions we have set up for children.

I am delighted to be able to respond to Dr. Bruner's suggestion that we must start first of all with real problems and then solve them in terms of real content. This suggests that we have to go back to teaching by discovering problem-solving methods, in which we can start with materials drawn from the children's own lives, and then move on to use the materials that help to get the kind of mastery of content that will make a difference in what they do, both as children and as adults, as they apply knowledge to the persistent problems of our time. This means that we as teachers have to be able to take risks ourselves. We have to be willing to experiment with a kind of real dialogue with the children, and be prepared to set up experimental centers where children can express their feelings in a non-threatening situation; at the same time the teacher must have a plan of action that involves the systematic use of real content that will give the children the kind of cognitive mapping that Dr. Bruner is asking for.

Dr. Bruner: May I just make two brief comments. I plead for your help. I think that the dichotomy, the sharp dichotomy, of cognitive on one side and affective on the other is a dichotomy that had probably never had very much use and certainly has outlived its usefulness. It is quite apparent that there is a connection between everything that Dr. Shaftel and I have been saying. To try to separate them is to falsify to some extent the fact that the problems of cheating are as much problems of thought as they are problems of feeling. It does involve, among other things, the sense that in the end you get yourself caught in such a web that you lose your freedom to tell the truth, which is a terrible loss.

The second thing that I'd like to plead for is that we place somewhat more emphasis upon the capacity of children, given the nature of situations, to invent problems on their own: that we don't have to give them problems, they see problems. If you look at what they write, if you look at how they talk, if you give them half a chance to talk, you're struck with the fact that their world is impregnated with problems of one kind or another. We can follow them, in a very important kind of way. For example, you could ask a child what he saw on his way home that was interesting, that was "trouble"; it is possible to start there. Rather than thinking entirely that we are involved in teaching, we can also learn. You can make much more progress letting the children describe and find problems.

Weldon, the Oxford Platonist, once made the comment that there are three types of things in the world. One of them you could call troubles: troubles are a kind of inexplicable anxiety. Then there were puzzles: puzzles are beautiful forms that had kind of a unique solution or a beautiful crystalline structure to them. Weldon commented on the fact that, as likely as not, people make problems by learning how to impose puzzle forms on troubles. This is an important point to bear in mind, because the thing to do is to take someone's troubles and give him an opportunity to develop models, or puzzles. This can come partly from his own experience, and partly from the distillate of the fact that people have had the same experiences many times, which have often been caught in the form of art. Unquestionably, fifty years from now, when the history of the black rebellion in America is written, one of the things that's going to be central is the role of the gifted Black writer in America who is making people aware of what the plight is. I urge that one of the most revolutionary things that there is is literature; history, myth, poetry -- these are powerful things that exist. The models do not always need to be created out of one's own experience, but one can go to these forms for one's own edification.

One last thing I would say about problem finding and giving students a hand and a voice in running their own educational system is that whether it is in the white ghetto of the isolated suburb or the black ghetto of the central city, we get the students when they come to the university. I'd like to have them well trained to bring about social change. By the time we get them, unfortunately, this heavy experience of militancy is all heart and not enough head. Teach them to be *effectively* militant; start in the elementary school.

Dr. Shaftel: I am at the moment mounting a project to teach young children at the elementary school level how to get things from the power structure in the elementary school. What works and what doesn't work when you want to bring about some change if you're nine or ten years old? I would suggest that that's not all affect either; there are some very definite kinds of strategies that are involved that we can draw upon from social psychology and from sociology in order to get it done. We tend to fall into the trap of "either/or." In 1944 as a young curriculum consultant, I wrote an article for *Educational Leadership* called, "Subject Matter or the Child" -- it was under the title of "Exploding Myths" -- in which I suggested that the child could not "realize" himself unless he put his teeth into some real content, which would then enable him to move ahead and explore.

I am exceedingly troubled by the fact that in America we seem to lack a capacity for developing a philosophic framework within which to look at innovations (e. g. I have been following the Plowden commission report on schools in England and looking at some of the Leicestershire material). This incapacity means that we tend to try one package one year; if that doesn't get the results, we buy another package another year; we are constantly waiting eagerly for another new publication which might perhaps solve "the problem." Instead, we should be asking ourselves: "What are the successes of the present educational system that we want to retain, and where are the areas that we ought to improve?" We should be examining new ideas and attempting far more of our own experiments. As it is, we are often guilty of throwing out the baby with the bath.

I have been reading a very interesting book, by Sarah Smilansky, about the effects of socio-dramatic play on the learning of disadvantaged children. This study was made in part because when Israeli teachers tried to teach the children from non-literate groups that came into Israel to read or to get ready for a Western European type of school, they failed. They failed to be effective. Smilansky's research people went back and looked at what was known about very young children from these cultures. And as they observed the role of play in the cognitive development of the child, they observed three dimensions of play: physical play, representational play, and interpersonal play. At one level, all the children were able to play. This was the level of physical play. At the next level (representational play), the researchers found that their "disadvantaged children" did not know how to do it. At the third level (interpersonal play and interraction), the researchers found that disadvantaged children were unable to do that either. Smilansky surmised that what had happened was that these children had had as many experiences as the European Israeli children, but they had not had the kind of help in establishing the connections between their experiences that middle class European parents gave to their children. They then laid out a very interesting experiment with three different treatments in which they helped children to use play as a way of exploring meanings -- putting things together, sharing ideas, and working out the meanings with their peers. The results were very effective.

This should serve to make us realize that, in our push for all the new packages of knowledge for almost every primary school in America, play as a means of learning has disappeared; we do not have time for it. We are too busy with the new math, with the new linguistics, with the new social studies. Instead of looking upon play as a way in which the child structures his experience, shares it with others and makes it available for us to look at and work with, we have just eliminated it. We have in fact misinterpreted our own need for better ways of developing cognitive abilities.

We need somehow to maintain a sense of perspective when we examine childhood, and the way a child grows into the world. I have found, when I have used active play forms with "disadvantaged" children, that they solved problems just as well as children who were "privileged." In fact, I have found that when I have gone into the so-called ghetto schools, many of the children were better equipped to cope with problem-solving of certain kinds than the children who had been protected from solving problems in privileged areas. We need to examine what we impose on the children and what we deprive them of in our programs; we need to give them programs which have a better balance.

Sophia Nelson: We've heard so much about the disadvantaged children. This has come to be a destructive label to a considerable extent. I wonder whether it might not be worthwhile to shift our emphasis to the ways in which we are disadvantaged teachers? First of all I think, if we assume that the "disadvantages" are only of one kind, then we will feel, for example, that the child who does not speak what each of us may differently consider a standard dialect is especially disadvantaged and that we who do not understand his dialect are not. But the disadvantage is ours in that we do not recognize the multiplicity of dialects recognized, in various places, as "standard." If we feel that the child having such a dialect comes to school ignorant and impolite, we are not recognizing that this again is a mistake of ours, a result of our miseducation, our own different kinds of disadvantages. The disadvantage which white Americans have in their background derive from the ways that we (Black and White) have lived together. These disadvantages leave the White person or teacher knowing much less about Black people than Black people know about White people.

Dr. Bruner: I would dearly love to see a way of dis-disadvantaging the teacher, so to speak. One of the things that I thought of from the point of view of these working parties that would go into the classroom, on my wild-man Tuesday and Thursday, is precisely discussions of this kind. What people know about each other and what they are willing to say about each other should be one of the most important discussions; there has to be a breaking of some of the secret places. Then there should be discussions of other very deep institutions, such as the kind of conception of marriage that grows up within the society of the suburb of America -- this has been a matter of concern -- or the image of the city that grows up within this cotton-wool suburb.

These problems need airing; they need confrontation. This is how problems should be located, rather than by saying, "We'll tell you what the problems are and you go solve them."

Participant: What about instead of just discussing on Tuesday and Thursday, living on Tuesday and Thursday?

Dr. Shaftel: I had the experience of interviewing a group of rival Mexican-American gangs in a Southern California high school a few years ago. I met with each boy or girl individually and talked with them about what school was like and what happened to them in school. The thing that hit me as I listened to their stories was that what they were offered in their classroom had no relevance to what they wanted for themselves.

I also talked with a social studies class in Los Angeles. These kids had gone out into this suburb of Los Angeles where there was nothing for them to do, and had made a survey of the town. They found out where kids hung around, and what they did. There was no place where young people could gather. So they went ahead and designed a proposal for a youth center and when they presented it to the city council, the city council thanked them and did nothing about it. They were a very unhappy, bitter group of people who felt that the school was a futile place.

So I would suggest that if we are going to go out into the community, we should choose genuine problems; and we should ensure that children can experience problem solving, and can be successful, so that they feel that they have some power -- both intellectual power and social power.

This means that we as teachers have a lot to learn, since we ourselves have been excluded from real participation in the society. Whenever we become involved in a real problem, then we are targets of attack. We have to learn to be brave enough to be the targets of the attack. And we have to learn to be wise enough to know how to set up projects which can work.

Education and the Economic Process

Kenneth Boulding
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado

Formal education is only a part, and perhaps not even the largest part, of the total learning process which goes on in society. It is this total learning process which underlies the whole dynamics of human history, and the whole process of evolution. What is happening in society at the present time is the result of a continuing process of learning which has been going on for several billion years. The only thing which can evolve is knowledge. It is a fundamental fact that mass and energy are conserved; knowledge is not. The education process began, in a sense, when the hydrogen atom learned how to take another electron and become helium. This has been going on ever since.

By far the most important characteristic of the state of human society, at any moment of time, is the stock of knowledge and its distribution -- what Pierre Teilhard de Chardin calls the noosphere, this gossamer sphere of knowledge that encircles the earth and is now primarily contained in human organisms. Although the other animals have some, quantitatively we have a near monopoly of it.

This noosphere, however -- this stock of human knowledge -- is constantly being consumed by ageing and death. Death is an enormous consumer of human knowledge: all human knowledge is lost every generation. By that, I mean the kind of knowledge which a man has acquired and made his own, not what is handed down in writing. All the libraries in the world, without somebody to read them, would do little good. Knowledge is appallingly fragile, and is constantly being consumed and has to be replaced by the total learning process. The learning process not only replaces what death destroys, it adds to what was there before; it has been adding to it at an accelerating pace in the last few thousand years.

The Paleolithic was a period of human development when very little further knowledge was being "added to" the knowledge which then existed. The astonishing thing about the Paleolithic to my mind is that, according to the anthropologists, creatures with the same genetic constitution as ourselves were able to stay in a stable state of culture for nearly two hundred thousand years. This happened partly because they didn't live very long. The average age of death in the Paleolithic was somewhere between twenty-five and thirty. If there is no one over thirty, knowledge grows very slowly. Every generation in recent historical time has increased this stock of knowledge a little. And even in the Paleolithic, there must have been some increases in knowledge; the cave paintings suggest this. But where a civilization is as vulnerable to disease and epidemics as was the Paleolithic, where there is short life-expectancy, then knowledge is easily lost, as there is no one "old" around to transmit experience to the next generation. And if knowledge is not transmitted to the young, it dies out -- in one generation.

Thus education, and especially formal education, is the most crucial activity of society from the point of view of its continued existence. If it were not for formal education, society would simply disappear in one generation. One of the problems of education is that, as I am suggesting, we know practically nothing about it; we know practically nothing about human learning. The human organism is an almost inconceivably complex apparatus. We start off with some ten billion neurons -- I understand we lose a hundred thousand a day all our lives, but we still have a lot of marbles left even at the end. An organization of this degree of complexity is far beyond the capacity of our explicit theoretical models. We don't really know much about the physiological basis of memory, and much of what is written in this field consists of imaginary physiology. We know something about teaching and education at the level of what we might call "folk knowledge" (we have been teaching people for quite a while; we must know something about it, and it seems to work in some mysterious way); but we don't have much formal knowledge about how men learn. The knowledge stock is passed on from one generation to the next, and it is increased generation after generation; but nobody really knows how we do the increasing or the passing on, and both may be done more by good luck than by good management. Finally, we just don't know much about the relation between the inputs of information into the human organism and the building up of the knowledge structures out of this information.

Emboldened by the prevailing ignorance about how we learn, a simple-minded economist may try a few propositions about human learning. I want to try to suggest how an economist might look at human learning -- not how a psychologist would look at the same phenomenon. Psychologists know a lot about rats, but they don't know as much about people. As an economist I come in where angels fear to tread.

I have five points. First: The learning of facts and the learning of values are closely interrelated and are part of essentially the same process: that is, as we build up our image of the world, this image develops a value structure so that we rate certain aspects of the image more highly than others, and the valuing of these aspects is very largely learned, as our image of the world is learned.

The new baby has a few genetic values that are innate. It likes mother, it doesn't like being wet, it doesn't like loud noises, and it doesn't like falling. After this point, its behavior and attitudes are acquired until it ends up liking sukiyaki or doing something that isn't innate at all. The more we look at the learning process, even in the lower animals -- the monkeys for instance -- the more it becomes clear that there are practically no instincts. There is practically no such thing as "human nature." (I don't believe in nature at all. I think anything that's any good is artificial. The natural world is wet, damp, cold, and uncomfortable, and we obviously want to get away from it as soon as we can.) Man is an artifact; he is his own artifact. Each one of us here is an artifact, more custom-built than a Ford car, but still an artifact. We have been produced by our experience, by our society, by the enormous information input that we have had, and also by our own capacity for producing information internally.

Perhaps the most extraordinary thing about the human organism, aside from its capacity to "take in" an enormous amount of information, is that it is so complex that it develops a vast internal output of information *into itself*: that is, the imagination. We are now beginning to understand that perception is very largely learned. The outside world does not simply 'imprint' itself on our minds, but our senses act as a critic of the imagination; the mind is in no sense a *tabula rasa*; it is an enormous great burgeoning windmill of images and impressions and ideas and imaginations. *Imagination is the key to perception*; and *perception is only a critique of the imagination*. We are all imagining all sorts of things here. Our eyes and ears are telling us that about ten thousand of them are untrue. This process of checking image against perception is a continuing one. The fact that it is going on all the time again illustrates the incredible complexity of the human organism.

Second, knowledge -- what we see, what we allow as 'input' -- grows toward 'imagined' payoffs. *It grows toward the more highly valued elements in the potential image.* We see the world the way in which we do because it pays us to do so. (My favorite illustration of this comes from astronomy. Only astronomers under twenty-five have ever seen the canals on Mars. It is the old astronomers whose eyes are not quite so good who have the jobs and who have the power, so that if young astonomer does see canals on Mars, he tends to dismiss them as illusions. The space probe suggests that they *are* illusions -- but they might not have been.) Our whole image of the world grows in the directions that we think are going to pay off.

Third, because of this second principle above, the fundamental key to understanding the human learning process is evaluative feedback, as to the rewards or the disappointments of certain intellectual actions. The real key to the learning process is to make the perception of failure rewarding, for only the legitimation of failure allows 'perception' to modify our images. The main reason for the success of the scientific subculture in the last three hundred years is it was a subculture which legitimated failure. It was all right to do an experiment and have it fail, whereas in political life, and I'm afraid all too often in religious life, anything which fails is automatically concealed. This sort of concealment is antithetical to the learning process in that the learning process consists of 'learning from failure' -- allowing a perception or action which fails to fulfill your expectations to modify your image of the world. Success teaches you that the world is merely a reflection of your own preconceptions.

Fourth: for the learning process to continue, the individual must himself place a high value on the learning process, or he will stop learning altogether. If the learning process requires both a 'pay off' and 'failure,' it is obviously quite complicated. An enormous number of people stop learning at an appallingly early age. A great many of our educational institutions seem even to encourage this, especially the institution of 'the Ph. D.,' which is all too often a device to keep people from learning thereafter. This educational pollution is a critical problem, as it means that the present education system too often produces knowledge which isn't knowledge and people who are not capable of learning in the future.

Consider for a moment this dilemma, implicit in any effort to provide evaluative feedback to the person who is learning. How does one ensure that an activity or experiment does not result in negatively valued feedback? For example, if someone goes to where he thinks the post office is and it isn't there, he has failed, in one sense. He has received 'negative' feedback. But it may not be negatively valued. Such disappointment can produce one of two effects. It can teach him that he has made a mistake and should correct it, or it can teach him that he is no good and will always make mistakes -- that he is incapable of correcting his mental picture from experiences. The distinction between these two responses is very fine, but one stimulates learning and the other leads to some destruction of the personality.

If we try to identify the places in our society where education seems to be destructive -- and there are such places -- we are going to find that we have gone over this fine edge, giving the kind of evaluation that destroys the personality instead of destroying the mistake. It is a very difficult line to define and to perceive. In the schools I feel we are always treading this tightrope. The child makes a mistake; the good teacher explains it in such a way that the person or identity of the child is not threatened by this. And the bad teacher says, "Oh, you're always doing that. You're no good."

However, the fact that we do succeed in passing the knowledge structure on indicates that we must be doing something right. Obviously, what we are doing cannot be all destructive. And the American system is certainly more humane than the British system in which I grew up, which is a (fortunately inefficient) design for the narrowing of the personality into a straight-jacket of arbitrary propriety.

Furthermore, in evaluating educational systems, we must also remember not to neglect the other aspects of the total learning process. The family, for instance, is an enormously important institution offering education. We know far too little about the processes of education in the family. To what extent is father necessary, to what extent is he a good riddance? It depends on the man, obviously. There are many areas here about which we need to know more.

Fifth, and very obviously, the economic system affects the educational system, and the educational industry fits into the economy and does things to it. Let me try to suggest how two of our concerns in economics particularly apply to education: we are concerned with how society is organized through exchange; and we are concerned with scarcity and what to do about it (although other institutions and other social sciences are also involved in handling scarcity).

Scarcity is one of the basic underlying 'environments' of human life. The fact that we only have twenty-four hours a day has introduced scarcity into human life right from the beginning. Every time one chooses a certain activity, another kind of activity is being neglected: this is scarcity. In the learning process there is no "economy of abundance," when the necessity for choice is so fundamental. And insofar as the learning process involves the use of scarce outside resources, economics is involved.

Economics should be very important to the study of formal education. It is a serious challenge to the economics profession that, until now, we have invested very little in the economics of education (e. g. compared with our investment in agricultural economics). An enormous amount of time and energy has been given to the economic study of agricultural production functions, for example, whereas the input-output relations in education have been comparatively neglected. I can count the well-known educational economists almost on the fingers of one hand; a study of the indices of economic publications will show a marked discrepancy between the large number of publications which are put out in the field of agricultural economics (agriculture even now amounts to only five per cent of the Gross National Product) and the small number of publications which exist in the area of the economics of education. This is something I hope we may be able to rectify in the next generation.

In the manipulation of scarcities, one of the great problems of the economics of education today is that a large part of it is in what I have been calling the "grants" sector of the economy rather than in the exchange sector. If we contrast, for instance, the educational industry (which is now about seven per cent of the Gross National Product), with, let us say, the automobile industry, we see that the automobile industry is almost wholly in the exchange sector of the economy, whereas education is largely supported by the one-way transfers through taxation -- it is in the public grants sector. The grants economy has been rising quite rapidly in the United States, from about three per cent in 1910 to somewhere around thirteen per cent today. Nevertheless, it is not indefinitely expansible. The total of grants, both public and private, is a function largely of the sense of community, for a grant is a symbol of identification between the grantor and the recipient.

The educational industry today is facing an increasingly severe economic crisis because of the fact that it is growing larger all the time and is really outrunning the capacity of the grants economy to support it, as witnessed by the increasing failures of voters to approve school bonds and millage increases. The educational industry is likely to grow almost as far into the future as we can see, because, as the stock of knowledge increases all the time, the amount of resources which have to be devoted to transmitting it from one generation to the next must likewise increase. Knowledge now approximately doubles every generation. In the Paleolithic age, it perhaps doubled in two hundred thousand years; and in what I think of as the "age of civilization," now coming to an end, it doubled possibly about every thousand years. This means that the cost of education is going from seven per cent of the Gross National Product to eight per cent to nine per cent to ten per cent to eleven per cent to twenty per cent; by the middle of the next century it will probably be twenty-five per cent. Eventually the increase in knowledge will come to an end. I expect the whole scientific revolution to come to an end within the next thousand years, simply because there will then be so much knowledge that we will have to spend all of our time transmitting it and there won't be any time left over for research.

Educational costs also grow because education is a technologically stagnant industry. In an unprogressive industry the price of the product continually rises, because people in the unprogressive industry are paid as much as people in the progressive ones. The unit cost of education therefore continually rises and the total cost of education grows for two reasons, the physical size of the industry grows; and the cost per unit and so total cost as a proportion of the Gross National Product grows because of its lack of technological progress.

One of the differences between the grants economy and the exchange economy is that the feedback in the exchange economy is pretty fast, whereas in the grants economy, it is either very slow or nonexistent. If the Ford Motor Company produces an Edsel, it very soon finds out. If the Ford Foundation produced an Edsel, nobody would ever find out. If the Department of Defense produced an Edsel, nobody would find out until after we were all dead. The weakness of the information *feedback* is a grave general weakness in the grants economy. And we see this in education also. There is very little feedback from educational expenditure, and therefore, little learning about how it is to be made more productive.

All the measures of educational productivity and the productivity of teachers are grossly inadequate. The current crisis in the financing of education is directly related to the state of the international system, since the grants economy also includes the defense economy. I have just seen a very interesting paper which suggests that every dollar of increase in the defense budget comes mainly out of education. The Department of Defense is much more like the Ford Foundation than the Ford Motor Company; it is more like the Catholic Church than like General Motors. It's essentially a quasi-religious organization. It is not in the exchange economy, but in the grants economy, and this is an 'economy' in the sense that the total of grants is limited, so that a grant to one sector usually means no grant to another. The growth of Defense is the principal threat to education today, and an expansion of the defense budget nearly always results in a failure of the education industry to expand. This is why educational progress is thwarted.

Given what is happening in the national and international community, it may be increasingly necessary to get education out from under the grants economy and to put it more and more in the exchange economy, through some device such as educational banks which will explicitly recognize the fact that education is a good investment and lend money to any or all qualified students, to be repaid, for instance, by a surcharge on their future income tax.

For a while it was thought that education was the principal requirement for economic growth. But then it was realized that many people do in fact invest in the wrong kinds of education, and we now see that education is only a key to economic growth if people invest in the right kind of education. On the other hand, there is a great deal of evidence that the "right kind" of education is a good investment for the average *individual*. He will earn more income as a result. But what is a good investment for the individual as well as the community can safely be put into the exchange system. Hence, I am in favor of having all educational institutions charge the full cost of their education to the student. I'm greatly against a hidden cost in education. If it costs $20,000 a year to make a doctor, then the student should be charged this amount. As an economist, I do not believe that anything that is costly should be free and I don't think any of the best things in life are free. Then, where it is necessary to subsidize education -- as it is -- we should subsidize the *student*, not the school.

This logic also suggests that private and public education institutions should be free to compete on equal terms. There is no reason why education should be a public monopoly. I am in favor of having public enterprise in education. I am not in favor of abolishing the public schools (i.e. presently tax supported) as some of my more extreme colleagues on the Left (or Right) are. There is a great deal to be said for a system in which one can have a variety of education institutions that can compete with one another, and under an educational bank proposal this could be done. The people for whom education is successful, in terms of giving them more income, will then pay more surcharge on their income tax than those for whom it is unsuccessful; the estimate is that the amount would not be more than about one or two per cent. Failing some device like this, we may be in danger of a real economic collapse of the educational industry, which would be an enormous disaster for society.

A further important aspect of the educational economics concerns the distribution of educational opportunities. *There is a great deal of evidence that the persistence of the poverty problem in this country, in spite of our successful economic development, is a result of the maldistribution of educational opportunities and indeed maldistribution of the whole learning process.* In a real sense both poverty and crime are learned in the subcultures which produce them. The present urban problem in this country is largely due to our technological progress in agriculture. We now have enormous numbers of first generation urbanites, and it seems to take three generations to learn to live in the city! Our urban crisis is the result of an essentially temporary phase in our society. In the future there is going to be less urban migration. Only seven per cent of the population of this country is in agriculture now, whereas, even in 1900, it was fifty per cent. And, in another generation, most of the people in the city will be second-generation city-dwellers. The degenerative social system in the cities is a problem peculiarly appropriate to the grants economy. Presently, we not only waste the grants economy on defense; we waste it on the rich and, hence, do not have anything to spare for the places where grants are really needed -- the areas of the otherwise self-perpetuating 'poverty' cultures and 'delinquent' cultures.

We do very little to improve education for the poor since education is still very largely financed by the local grants economy, and the local tax system. The central cities have not been able to expand into the suburbs in the twentieth century, in the way in which they did in the nineteenth century; the tax base of the city is continually declining, and, hence, there is a degenerative system in the cities. The only way to break into it is through the grants economy, probably only through the federal grants economy. It is hard, though, to work the grants economy as it ought to work, because the people who give the grants are the middle class people such as congressmen, who tend to give grants in such a way that they go to the rich, and it is difficult to devise institutional devices which will make the grants economy efficient. This is where the guaranteed annual income, which is favored by both Left and Right these days, might possibly solve a problem.

A fascinating, but relatively unexplored, related problem is the relation of economic incentives to learning in the individual student. If learning moves toward payoffs, ought this to be reflected in devices for distributing money. Would people be ruined, for instance, by a guaranteed annual income? Traditional formal education relies very heavily on the "threat system;" on the other hand, a great deal of psychological experiment in this field suggests that the hope of reward is a far stronger incentive than the fear of punishment and that, indeed, punishment, insofar as it destroys an individual's self-respect, operates to destroy his learning capacity. It is an exciting idea to think of paying students to be 'successful' or to fail in legitimated ways -- in ways that would enable them to learn. At this point, however, I am merely competent to raise questions, not to give answers.

As we look at the problem of scarcities and of managing the cost of education, we need to attend to an important development in the economics of education, the significance of which is very hard to assess at the moment, i.e. the development of teaching machines and computer-aided instruction. What is clear is that these technological developments must be evaluated in the total educational process conceived as a social system. The value of a machine depends on the system in which it is embedded: machines are costly by comparison with human teachers; they do have a comparative advantage in patience and in providing the kind of feedback which is constructive rather than destructive. Teachers will need to observe this development very critically.

The last thing I have to say is that the fundamental purpose of education is to create people, and the question is what kind of people. We as educationists need to have some sort of image of the future, some sort of image of what the world is all about and what the world is going to be like, in order for us to produce an image of the kind of values which will be appropriate for the world ahead. What I think is happening in this extraordinary period of change and development is that we are moving towards what I (and Barbara Word) have called the "spaceship earth." It is very clear as we look at the world from space that the earth is a very small, crowded spaceship, destination unknown. We are in a precarious situation; it is possible that the evolutionary experiment in this part of the universe is going to come to an end; the transition from the old world to the new is, and will continue to be, a very difficult one.

Up to now, a man has always lived on a psychologically flat earth -- a great plane -- or a "plain where ignorant armies clash by night." But, on that plane, there has always been, for the defeated or the hostile or the venturesome, somewhere to go. We have never before really lived on a sphere. Now we are all very much aware that we live on a sphere, and a very small and crowded sphere. On a spaceship, the kind of values that are appropriate to the great plains won't work. There has to be a moral revolution. We certainly can't afford to have international war in a spaceship. We cannot even afford to have revolution in a spaceship. I am an anti-revolutionary because I think that revolution is too costly and too dangerous for a spaceship. We simply can't horse around too much. We have to learn patience -- how to ride these dangerous and rapid evolutionary processes.

The great problem in the spaceship is pollution. We are beginning to realize this in the earth now. In a spaceship, there are no mines; there are no sewers. You have to eat your own excrement; let's be crude about it. You have to transform what you give out so you can take it in. You have to live in a circular flow. This will be as true of society as it is of anything else. Up to now, we have always had social sewers. We spewed out the people that we couldn't use in society, into the slums and into the mental hospitals, even into the schools; we held them in a cesspool until they died.

In the spaceship, we cannot afford to do this. Just as we have to learn to reprocess sewage, we're going to have to reprocess human outcasts. This will require a lot of learning on our part, particularly on the part of the educational system. The great aim of education, in the next hundred years, has to be to create the human identity. No other identity will do. The Black identity will not do. The White identity will not do. It is not important enough. By far the most interesting thing about a Black human being is that he is human, and the same goes for any other color. Racial differences are biologically too small to build an identity around. There must, of course, be cultural identities. We must preserve and create diversity, cultural diversity, but that is a matter of informal culture. Black studies, like Jewish studies, or Catholic studies, should find their place in the Sunday school or its equivalent. I'm all in favor of a "mosaic society;" I don't want everybody to homogeneous; I don't want a uniform society as a kind of warm, thin, human pea soup. I want a society that is "dappled, original, spare, strange, " as Gerard Manley Hopkins said. I want to have a society in which there are pink people, yellow people, black people, Seventh Day Adventists, Communists, Buddhists, and the whole great gamut of human variety. I don't want a uniform society at all. But, if we are going to have a mosaic society, it has to have some kind of cement. There has to be a frame to put the mosaic in and cement to hold the pieces together. This cement is the human identity -- a basic loyalty to the human race, a basic loyalty to the spaceship. This, it seems to me, is what the educational system has not produced. In every country in the world, it is either illegal or immoral to be a human being. If the human race is to survive, then the educational industry, if an economist can call it that, has to take as its greatest task the creating of the human identity.

The Education of Uncritical Americans

Wayne Booth
Dean of the College
University of Chicago

As I read through the reports of previous conferences in this series, I found myself, I will have to admit, both impressed and troubled. I do not know of any other conference series that has maintained such a challenging level of discussion, but I was disturbed by a sense of the sheer imposibility of carrying out even a fraction of the good suggestions offered.

To give the elementary teacher the education implied so far would require a lifetime, with no time left over for teaching. Almost everything on the list of what he or she needs to know looks good and is good. I quote two items from Mr. Olson's summary in The Craft of Teaching and the Schooling of Teachers: (1) "A thorough training in linguistics and in the psychological and sociological aspects of linguistic study: [a good thing and a very big thing for every teacher to have; a good thing for every teacher to have studied]; (2) literature going beyond the 'Hundred Great' certified classics for children or adults to the mythoi, folk-narratives, games and graffiti of children presently in the schools and to materials created outside the Western stream and perhaps even outside the stream of literate culture. . . ." [again a good thing to have]. But that final item pretty well takes in all of world culture; and it would be nice for the teacher to have all of "world culture" as part of his study. But is it possible? And remember, this is only one part of the first conference. We surely must all wish that every teacher might really know "both what children 'have' for imaginative worlds and what they might have" (Craft of Teaching and Schooling of Teachers). Yet, can we really wish so much for the teacher?

I am sure nobody is more aware than is Mr. Olson that when we add new demands for a mastery of psychology (several branches of it), sociology, linguistics, world myths and social service principles and practices to what we already thought the teacher ought to know -- history, literature, science, rhetorical theory and practice, the social science and philosophy of the American and Western tradition -- then our demands are not merely discouraging to everybody who contemplates them, they are impossible.

We all know in our bones that such demands guarantee discouragement (and failure, if we were to take them seriously) unless we have lost all ability to look honestly at our own ignorance. Nobody attending the New Orleans conference exhibits more than a small fraction of the knowledge possessed by the imaginary paragon who haunts such conferences as these. What is more, not even the best teacher you or I ever had, or the best teacher we can now name, exhibits more than a fraction.

Is it any wonder, then, that our students training in education become desparate and start looking for gimmicks? Is it any wonder that even experienced teachers start thrashing about in search of a trend or a fashion or a formula that will cut through the absurd impossibilities?

I remember an institute for high school teachers in Utah, where I had been trying to sell the study of rhetoric as the most important single discipline for high school English teachers. To make my case, I was, of course, forced to define rhetoric very, very broadly indeed. One very troubled lady came to me afterwards and said, "Well, Mr. Booth, I've enjoyed your discussions; but I was just wondering if you couldn't give me a trend I could take back with me." I was stunned speechless at the time; but, as I think back on it, I cannot blame her. No one can function without some degree of clarity about what he's trying to do. Oversimplified and destructive forms of clarification will be clung to, so long as professional leaders fail to provide conceptual schemes that genuinely do make sense of what the teacher is expected to know and teach.

If, as everybody seems convinced, time is running out, and perhaps even has long since run out for American education, we have no time now for frills: we must cut through to essences. We must do so quickly and persuasively.

Yet, we all know that in any act as complex as elementary teaching, the essence of success is not likely to appear in any one man's formulation of what will make for success. I have never yet found a description of what the good teacher does at any level that seemed adequate to my own experience of good teachers. I know of no one else who has. (No doubt this is why fashions in educational diagnosis and prescription seem to be so erratic. For a while everybody thought that learning Latin and Greek under the strictest possible physical discipline would alone do the trick. And suddenly, less than a century later, we are being told that only engaging the pupil in problems of immediate relevance to him will do it; the classics be damned. Then suddenly it's linguistics or mythoi or a return to phonics and the three R's or what not).

If there are no formulae for success, and if we cannot know all that might be helpful to us, to what criteria can we appeal if we want to cut through these swings of fashion and develop a defensible view of what must be taught, not just what might be nice to teach? Far too often, we turn simply to our own past education, and every man is in danger of idolizing his own peculiar ignorance. If you ever had a teacher who really taught you something (as Churchill claimed, for example, that he had been taught grammar by diagramming), you will cling to it for all you're worth, and you will be likely to generalize about the usefulness of that particular bit of knowledge to all other men. There are still men alive who think that no real education will be possible until we receive the classics in their original languages, because they think that that is what made them so wise. And there are men -- equally narrow and dogmatic men, though seemingly more up-to-date -- who think that education will be saved by turning to non-western civilization or world culture or the mass media.

I think a somewhat more useful, or at least more honest, standard might be, "What do I wish I knew? What do I blame the schools for not having taught me or my children?" I'm willing to confess that the first thing that leaps to mind is Latin. Oh, how I wish I had been taught Latin! And yet I'm as certain as I am about my educational matter that Latin in and for itself can never serve, and will never again serve as a general prescription for a "successful" elementary or secondary education.

In recent years, the most lively and interesting prescriptions have depended on a third standard -- the prescriber's image, openly stated or implied, of what men are or what they might be. Reformers have been telling us that our education is killing spirits that might have lived: that to deprive a child of his capacity to use his imagination or his visual equipment or his native metaphorical resources or his folk traditions or his capacity for a loving engagement in his community is the worst of educational crimes. The usual emphasis of those appealing to this criterion is naturally upon bringing the classroom out from under the tyranny of "the teachers" or "the school districts" or "the superintendents' preconceived notions of what the child must learn." These kinds of liberation, the kinds of liberation from routine urged upon us by Holt, Kohl and Britten and many others, can turn out to be a most valuable educational swing of the pendulum -- I think they have already been that -- or they could turn out to be just another slovenly manifestation of "progressivism" depending on -- well, that's the question -- depending on what?

Ultimately, of course, whether the effects of the new "liberation" are desireable or hurtful will depend on the kinds of teachers who take up the ideas of the Holts, Kohls and Brittens and work them out in their own classrooms; and the kinds of teachers we have will depend on what kinds of teachers we train, and that will depend on what our ideas are about how teachers should be trained; so we're right back where we started. But, fortunately, with a difference: we can ask now what kinds of teachers we most lack and most need, and whether or not the current swing towards greater freedom in the classroom should continue.

Suppose we tried, this time around, not asking the question which is fashionable with what I consider the best educators these days -- namely "What will save children?" -- but tried asking instead the questions fashionable with non-educators and especially with the most dangerous enemies of the schools -- i.e. "What does society really need?" "What will really save our nation?" "What educational matter seems most conspicuously needed by this nation at this time?" It has been commonly assumed by the critics of the schools -- radical, liberal, conservative and reactionary -- that there is some real conflict between the two formulations, the one I used first and the one I'm turning to now. Liberals are aware of how easily "filling society's needs" can become a formula for stuffing in jingoist slogans and distortions. Conservatives, on the other hand, are aware of how easily "teaching the child" can excuse programs of a crippling vacuity. But it takes no great dialectical ingenuity to see that the only education that will really save the country is the kind that builds citizens "educated for freedom," as the old slogan goes.

I suppose that if I have to be called anything, it would be a liberal; and I palpitate when I read the stirring reports of those who insist on looking at "where the child is" and allowing his creative drives full sway. But just as Jimmy Britten said at one of these conferences that he wants, for a time, to take for granted that achievement of content will come if children are approached correctly, so I should like to take for granted, for now, that teachers will cherish creativity and imagination and individuality. I should like to ask exactly the question being asked by the Raffertys and the Reagans of this world, and in the language of the crassest of them: "What kind of product does our society most desperately need from our schools?"

If we shift thus to the enemy's ground, we can attack head-on certain reductive notions of "service to society" which quite rightly infuriate all liberals and certainly all members of the New Left. Our educational institutions are too often organized on what might be called "the typing pool model." We need so many engineers, doctors, computer analysts, and we must keep the pool full, or the whole machine will grind to a stop. To ask the question, "What kind of product does our society most desperately need from our school?" is, in my terms, to ask, "What particular kind of knowledge or skill is in such short supply as to threaten our very existence?" And to ask this question in this way has an advantage besides that of putting us on the enemy's ground: it almost forces us to drop any notion of a certain kind of knowledge or a set of concepts (what Miss Duckworth at one conference called "the nouns") as necessary to survival. It forces us to look for skills or habits of mind (what she called "the verbs," or "the statements including a verb.")

I can think of no body of information, no matter how complex, that we desperately need more of. The fact is that our population today knows more man for man, in this sense, than any nation has ever known before. We know more literature, more history, more technology, more pure science, more psychology, more sociology; as an English teacher I would like to have more people know Shakespeare or the modern novel. But it's perfectly evident that more knowledge of literature would not save us; the per capita knowledge of Goethe and Shakespeare in Germany before World War II was incredibly high. No, what we are looking for is not some bare knowledge, some set of concepts, but rather a form of action, a set of skills, that a school might legitimately take as its province, and thus that an educational program training teachers, might take as its province. This is very important, because there are many things we need that the schools cannot teach: they cannot directly teach one how to be a good congressman or president or how to build a good stable family.

But what is there within our power that we are peculiarly charged with? I submit that the one educational matter in shortest supply is the capacity for critical thought. What I mean by "critical thought" is very close to what several speakers at the Salt Lake City conference were calling "reflective thinking." I prefer the word "critical," despite its confusions, for reasons that I hope will be clear. I assert baldly now that what our elementary and secondary graduates lack that is most drastically killing us and them, what our college graduates and indeed our college teachers lack, what in fact you and I lack most seriously, is not good will or love or even moral force or respect for students' individuality -- though God knows we could use more of all of these. What we most dangerously lack is precisely what ought to be clearly within our reach: that old-fashioned virtue, the determination to relate our convictions critically to each other and pursue the consequences, even when they cost us our prejudices or our comfort.

I speak from Chicago where students are sitting-in against the University in the belief that we have used political criteria in refusing to rehire an assistant professor. Last week, I was at Stanford, where students were marching to insist that an assistant professor be fired for political reasons. In the Chicago discussions, one faculty member managed in a ten minute speech to argue both that the University was guilty of using political reasons for not rehiring the woman and that the University should rehire her because we should give preference to members of the New Left.

I suppose it is possible to reconcile these two views according to some higher revolutionary principle. One could pretend in public to believe in the politically neutral university in order to build a politically committed university; but I got the impression, instead, that it had never occurred to that young man to worry very much about whether his various convictions could be coherently related to each other. I did not get a chance to talk with him, but I did ask a student about the relation of the Stanford protest to the Chicago protest. He was not at all troubled by any possible conflict. Stanford should fire the man if the students decide that he is a racist; Chicago should keep the woman because universities should not use political criteria in hiring and firing. Whether you find my example in any way representative is not my immediate concern here. I am aware that it is not easy to prove what I am charging. I am not saying that Americans are less critical than they used to be (though I suspect they are); I am simply claiming that they are less capable of critical thought than they must be if we are to survive. To put it in another way, there is an astonishing discrepancy between the enormous amount of energy and time which we spend on education in America and the limited amount of our behavior that could be called, in this respect, "educated behavior."

What exactly is this educated behavior I seek? First, and most obviously, maybe even finally, it is the habit of questioning what other men say, of looking them in the eye and demanding, "What is your evidence?" When one of the great scholars here at the University of Chicago, R. S. Crane, was on his deathbed two years ago, I visited him in the hospital. Hoping to encourage him, I said, "Ronald, you're looking better today." He looked up, and with what was almost a dying breath said, "What is your evidence?" He really believed in having evidence for what one said, and thus represented, even while dying, an ancient and honorable tradition, which I am saying that we have in some ways lost.

Most men think they are pretty good at this kind of thing. Almost everybody assumes that his own head is screwed on pretty tight. But in practice, most of us most of the time are skeptical only when what is said goes counter to our prejudgements. The result is that most pleas for critical thinking end up as pleas for the conclusions of the pleader. (Mine will turn out to be the same unless I remind myself that what is dangerous for America is not that it is full of people who don't agree with me, but rather that it is full of people who don't know or care why they disagree with me.) We are unable, as a result of our incapacity to question what supports our prejudgments, to engage in the kind of discussion which would lead anybody to a change of mind on justifiable, warrantable grounds. We all seem to be, in fact, ready to believe the first passionate voice we hear.

An educated man, in the sense in which I use the word here, is a man who requires of himself certain kinds of mental activity before he will accept an idea, follow a leader, embrace a plan of action, or embark on a way of life. The test of such a man is never what he believes simply, but rather the process he's gone through in deciding whether to believe. He may or may not, in a given matter, be right. He will most certainly be wrong a good deal of the time, especially in an age like ours when so many men are working full time to deceive as many of us as possible. But he will have built within him as an inescapable habit the one force besides luck that can save a man from his own errors: namely, the habit of asking if anything can be said for his beliefs other than that they are his.

If many of our school or college graduates had this habit, I am sure our popular media could not get away with the carelessness, the deliberate distortion, which they reveal each day and week. What a critical reading of most of the stuff pushed at us, at all levels, from all areas, shows is a picture of an implied reader (sometimes an actually stated reader but more often an implied one) who is so badly educated that he would never think of reading critically. It is a picture that ought to shame us as educators.

Let me take an example: an article on "The Good Things in America Today" in U. S. News and World Report. The article was published just after the Democratic primary, when perhaps more people than ever before were calling America sick. Though the article is thinly disguised as a report, it argues quite openly from the title on, "that the nation's strengths are great and varied, that the United States today is not the sick giant so often portrayed by critics, but a strong and powerful nation, one that continues to be the envy of the world at large."

Now I think a case could be made for this position, but it would not be an easy case. If it were made with care by somebody who took the trouble to look at the arguments for our being a sick society, it would induce thought on both sides and might even lead to some ideas about how to capitalize on our strengths and reduce our weaknesses. But *U. S. News and World Report* does not so handle the case: the article reveals, in its every detail, that the anonymous author assumes a reader fat for the kill; he not only already completely agrees with the author that America is well off, "healthy," or very nearly so, he is also totally unaware of any possible counter-arguments which an opponent might offer, and totally indifferent to all demands for coherence of argument, or precision and relevance of factual evidence. It is clear that the editors of *U. S. News and World Report* see their readers as prosperous, white businessmen. There is nothing especially wrong in that; but that they should anticipate ignorant, uncritical, complacent, white businessmen is disturbing, since it seems likely that most of the readers are formally educated -- not just high school graduates, but college-trained men.

The first three arguments in the article for the thesis that America is a healthy society appear under the boldface heading, "So Much for So Many." "Never in the past," it says, "has a society offered so much prosperity to so many of its people." The reader presumably can be counted on to remind himself that he shares in prosperity, he needs no proof that *his* material prosperity is a sign of *national* health. Yet, it takes only a moment's thought to recall that nobody who has claimed that the nation is sick has ever denied our material prosperity; not in this sense. If we are to make a case for a critical reader, we have got to do something more than make a simple assertion of a bare claim.

"Far from being a sick society," the quotation goes on, "Americans in the majority are showing themselves to be strong and morally responsible." It feels good to be told that you're strong and morally responsible (especially when others have been nagging at you about how peaked you look). The only evidence given at this point is that Americans are spending billions to erase poverty in the nation and more billions to help other nations. But again, this would never be denied as a bare fact by any critic, and the reader is expected to say to himself, I suppose, "Actually, I'm generous to a fault. All that money down the drain, and all we get for it is criticism."

The evidence for strength is "our nuclear defense system that is providing security for much of the world. American troops drove Communist invaders out of South Korea, kept the peace in Lebanon, staved off a Communist take over in South Vietnam." Again, what is revealing is that the author stops at this point. These all might be argued, and even proved, to be "good things," but here they are assumed to be self-evidently good things -- signs of our strengths. Again the reader is postulated as someone so uncritical that he will not know or will forget that for most of those who call the country sick, the undeclared war in Vietnam is one symptom of the disease.

Next we turn to culture: we learn that the American way of life is turning up everywhere. The two pieces of evidence offered are: the young people in communist countries are playing rock music; and in France, the light luncheon favored by American businessmen is making heavy inroads on the Parisian cuisine.

So we go on through this cheerful, mindless landscape.

There are, of course, some arguments in the piece that might be taken seriously by critics as well as by the pre-sold. For example, professors might be impressed by the assertion that university presses alone have multiplied sales five times since 1948. But the interesting revelations come from all those arguments that seem absurd or at best incomplete from any point of view other than that of "the uncritical American." The article is no tribute to those it flatters.

Some of its arguments are so curious that it is hard not to suspect that the editors were joking: "A French philosopher noted: 'To make life simpler in an increasingly complicated world is an American art. That art is making it possible, as one instance, for Americans to dial a number on the telephone and hear a prayer, a short sermon, the latest baseball scores, a lecture on alcoholism, or arguments against committing suicide.'" One can imagine exactly the same list used by proponents of the view that America is sick: i.e. "Americans can't distinguish the important from the trivial; they don't see the difference between dialing a prayer and praying." But such imaginings are not assumed to be within the capacity of the reader of this piece.

One could weight the arguments so as to allow one to visualize the uncritical reader whose biases are being played to, the reader who will not ask where the arguments stop. One could look at what lines of argument are most heavily emphasized and what played down or ignored. In this piece, economic power abroad and prosperity at home for the majority are dwelt on lovingly. "America's economic power, far from declining, is pushing ahead; as to economic power, American dominates the world. Predictions are heard that the industry which the U. S. owns in Europe soon will become the world's third largest economic force after that of America itself and that of Soviet Russia." When poverty is mentioned, it becomes "what passes for poverty;" this, in turn, is seen by many foreigners, the piece goes on, "as an acceptable standard of living." There is no mention of the reports of starvation or malnutrition in America. When Black America is discussed, the emphasis is almost entirely on the increased prosperity of those above the poverty line. Ghetto poverty is dismissed with a glance.

Even when the article finally returns for a second try at cultural matters -- education, books, and music -- the emphasis turns out to be statistical and economic. It is assumed that there is no reason for arguments about the quality of education so long as we have more people in college and high school than do other nations. Nothing needs to be said about the quality of the books we produce so long as the dollar volume of book sales has doubled in ten years. When religion is mentioned, again statistics are decisive: forty-five per cent of all Americans attend church during a typical week, ninety-seven per cent of all adult Americans believe in the existence of God.

Well now, no such analysis as I have been undertaking here can tell us whether the conclusions of the writer are true, as I said before. All we can say is that the reasons offered could be persuasive only for a reader with certain very strong and very obvious prejudgments and certain dangerous habits of mind: he believes in economic and military power in a very uncritical way; he is convinced by quantities rather than qualities; he enjoys personal prosperity and power, which he would rather feel about than think about; he wants to think of himself and his country as moral and generous and cultured but does not care about the details; and he is terribly eager to be convinced that things are getting better all the time.

The bold faced headings of the sections taken by themselves reveal these biases almost in schematic form; they read like the plot of a corny novel: "So Much for So Many," "Succor to the World," "Story of Progress," "Rise from Poverty," "Production Miracle," "A Rugged Dollar," "America's Head Start," "Passion for Education," "Europe Surpassed," "Book Buying People," "Wide Map for Culture," "How Americans Really Feel," "Steady, Undramatic Lives," "Money Ignored," "Courage Rewarded."

When we shift our concern with this kind of analysis from what is believed to how it is believed, it is easy to see that our problem is not simply one of a too-easy affirmation. What's wrong with the implied reader of that piece is not simply that he is too ready to believe; there is something much deeper than that. It is true that many of us are, like the readers of U. S. News and World Report, too ready to believe. We, in relation to what we read, are often like Laetitia Snap in relation to her lover in that wonderful novel Jonathan Wild: "He in a few minutes ravished this fair creature, or at least would have ravished her if she had not, by a timely compliance, prevented him." The country is indeed full of such round-heeled folk, and we have polite old-fashioned words for them: they're "credulous," or they're "gullible," or they're "superstitious."

But our problem is even worse with those who fail in the opposite direction, and the words for them are not so clear. Some of them we call cynical or suspicious; you might even coin a word, "substitious." Young people often try to stimulate education by moving from superstition to substition. After all, if I don't commit myself to any traditional cause or affirmation (or to anybody over thirty), nobody can accuse me of naive commitment.

It is interesting, on the other hand, that the whole of the older generation is often described as guilty of a kind of substition by young idealists. We elders are, they say, cynical, overly analytical; we spoil the world by intellectualizing it. College students often accuse faculty and administrators of using reason to postpone commitment and action, of substituting study and scholarship for the truths of the heart.

Well, which are we? Too ready to believe or too ready to doubt? A nation of sheep or a nation of mules? I'm suggesting that we are both: that too many of those who affirm or assert do so blindly, just as many of those who dig in their heels or say, "No" are reacting with equal blindness, (like the man who complained last fall that the trouble with Johnson was that you can't even rely on the opposite of what he says).

In short, men of all camps seem to have short-circuited the lines from evidence to conclusions. Every view, whether affirmation or negation, is a leap of blind faith. We seem to have lost our confidence in the process of reasoning through a problem to supportable conclusions, and have substituted for that process two kinds of credulity: either a blind confidence in doubt itself, leading to a corrosive but thoughtless process of mistrusting everything but one's own feelings; or a blind acceptance of this or that quick solution.

Obviously, the two forms of blindness are very closely related and easily lead into each other. Mankind cannot endure much doubt for long, and it's not surprising that men who have learned that nothing can be proved soon feel licensed to believe anything they damn well please. If no convictions can be finally supported by reason, then why not succumb to the will to believe something, anything, rather than operate in a belief vacuum? And of course, that's exactly what happens.

The new credulity that results takes many forms, depending on which converter, which missionary, happens to get to the empty mind first. And it seems to me, as I implied before, that the media themselves thrive on this credulity. If there were time, I would like to tell you about some of the experiences we have had in our sit-ins here with the press and the way they report their data. But instead of attacking the media (which it seems to me have generally erred from political conservatism), let me just mention something that happened yesterday in a meeting. It was a large meeting in which students who did not go into the building were trying to discuss their attitude toward the sit-in. In the middle of it, a student came and asked to be permitted to make an announcement. He got up and said that he had been told by a marshal of the protestors that three Chicago police were working in the building, and he implied that he thought arrests were imminent. Then he immediately came down into the audience where I was sitting and sat in the chair next to me and said, "Mr. Booth, is that true?" I said, "You mean that you would make an inflammatory statement like that without bothering to check?" It was clear that he had just never thought of checking, that he thought his first duty was to get the rumor out and then check it afterwards.

If there is an indifference or indeed hostility to factual checking, factual accuracy, the new credulity reveals itself more seriously. I think, in the wild proliferation of crackpot schemes and systems. All about us we see social and religious solutions being invented and embraced as lightly as one might choose a breakfast food. For some, it's the John Birch Society, a group whose works are clearly going to affect your life and mine with increasingly disastrous results in the next few years. For others it's left-wing groups showing equal carelessness about fact, and even an open contempt for any attempt to think things through. For some, it's religious organizations whose claims are embraced without a pretense at thought. For others, it is one or another of the pseudo-psycho-religions claiming to cure the soul with nudity or vegetables or group therapy sessions or orgone boxes or omphalic worship or touching each other or standing on your head.

No doubt each of these systems works, as we say, for its converts: miraculous cures occur in all new religions that are not to be scoffed at, especially when they're performed by the devil himself. Even those curious half-religions that spring up around academic subjects have the power to heal loneliness or boredom. If Bacon or Marlowe really wrote Shakespeare's plays, life may turn out to be interesting after all. And if I ask you for evidence, I'm at best a spoil-sport, and more likely, I'm an enemy of the light. We seem in short to be approaching a glorious age when every man will be entitled to his own cult as a birthright.

Can we wonder that even a man as intelligent as Malcolm X or another one as intelligent as Eldridge Cleaver should require some time to see through the myth of Yacub, when their white brothers with university degrees were preaching, say, Velikovsky's myth of the earth's history or Egyptian numerology or astrology -- that booming industry -- or astro-projection. I know men who talk as if they would give their lives for this or that totally conjectural theory about who killed Kennedy or King or Kennedy; about a currency standard that will save the world; or about how the Jews are conspiring for world mastery. Most of them seem convinced that commitment is so valuable that even a commitment to madness is better than apathy: witness the shameful handsprings turned by some intellectuals trying to defend the Marquis de Sade.

Somehow we have failed to teach those who pass through out schools that commitment is admirable when it is commitment to admirable causes and to accurate statement.

My point is, as you can see, an old one. Critical minds have the habit of saying yes or no only when there is some real warrant for saying yes or no. We can see immediately that in this respect our conventional picture of who is "culturally disadvantaged" shifts considerably. In this respect, Malcolm X and Eldridge Cleaver reading in prison -- reading avidly, intensively into the night with the dim prison light -- are far more educationlly advantaged than the suburban youth trying to choose the best college. The perspective on white culture provided by being black, and even more by being a black convict reading what white men say about themselves, builds in a habit of negative criticism that many of the so-called fortunate never achieve. In such circumstances, Cleaver said,

> I decided that the only safe thing for me to do was go for myself. It became clear that it was possible for me to take the initiative. Instead of simply reacting, I could act. I could unilaterally, whether anybody agreed with me or not, repudiate all allegiances, morals, values, even while continuing to exist within this society. My mind would be free, and no power in the universe could force me to accept something if I didn't want to. I would accept nothing until it was proved that it was good for me. I became an extreme iconoclast. Any affirmative assertion made by anyone around me became a target of tirades of criticism and enunciation.

Thus Cleaver, as a member of what he calls "Ofay Watchers Anonymous," spending his years in silence watching the ofays and trying to understand them, had a tremendous educational advantage. But at the same time, he obviously suffered from the handicap which most of us in most cultures never escape. He was sorely tempted never to apply his critical intelligence to his own convictions, once they were formed, and to the claims and arguments of oppressed peoples which he had embraced. It was thus much more difficult for him to de-convert from being a Black Muslim than it was originally to embrace his root-and-branch repudiation of white myths.

When the moment of de-conversion comes, Cleaver himself sees it as something much more radical and much more hopeful, almost as in the light of a miracle:

> If a man like Malcolm X could change and repudiate racism, if I myself and other former Muslims can change, if young whites can change, then there is hope for America. It was certainly strange to find myself, while steeped in the doctrine that all whites were devils by nature, commanded by the heart to applaud and acknowledge respect for these young whites, despite the fact that they are descendants of the masters and I, the descendant of slaves.

He goes on to say that he had believed that they were the devil itself, the devil's progeny itself.

Cleaver's second achievement is, however, still more of the heart than the head. He sees young whites saying what he believes, fighting for what he fights for, and he is forced to accept them. Now this is no mean thing, to change a conviction such as the conviction that whites are devils and to do this because you see some whites acting virtuously; but it doesn't take us far enough if we are to save ourselves. We cannot wait for the shattering experience to shake our prejudices. We must seek out the testing, and to do this we must have a habit of sympathetic exploration of other men's ideas, even after we have been given an initial critical norm.

Perhaps the most difficult intellectual feat of all is to learn to understand what another man is really saying. That requires, perhaps more than the ability to say either "No" or "Yes," the ability to say "Maybe." Saying "Maybe," and then refusing to rest until we have constructed the other man's position so clearly and sympathetically that we can decide on a justified "Yes" or "No," is the essence of the critical mind. It is an essence now, as ever, in desperately short supply.

I suppose you must be wondering why I have failed to get around to the tough problem of how to develop critical intelligence in elementary children. I hope I have given some hints about this. But the truth is that, like most people, I am more confident in my diagnoses than in my prescriptions. I certainly cannot claim to know any simple formulae for developing the processes of heart and mind that will carry you and your students and their pupils through fraud and greed and folly to beliefs and actions that will be both necessary intellectually and effective (effective because necessary). I am convinced that the task of becoming educated is more difficult than ever before. I am also convinced, in spite of what some people are saying, that it is still both possible and relevant. You cannot solve all of life's problems by learning to think, but you cannot solve any of them without it; you cannot avoid mistakes by determining to combat our new credulity, but you will make more of them if you simply swim with the tide.

Learning to think for yourself will of course get you into the kinds of trouble that simply accepting slogans and clichés will often avoid. It may, in fact, lead to imprisonment and even death if our society should finally, like many societies past and present, corrupt itself to the point of denying us the right to free thought. If I am right, in the next few years the uncritical Americans that we have been turning out in such great supply are going to come out of the woodwork in battle array and in increasing numbers. In their very existence, they are in indictment of American education, and by implication, of the teachers who have failed to educate them -- you and I and those we work with. In their attack on us, however, they may show us more clearly than some of us have seen what the nature of our vocation is.

We are committed to the awakening of minds, to the sharpening of the critical intelligence, to the creation of critical Americans. It is not the only thing that we are committed to, but there can be no profession nobler than this, and there can be no educational problem so acute as that of learning how to begin meeting this challenge in the earliest years. Finally, there is no profession nobler than that of trying to meet this challenge.

Response to Wayne Booth

Arthur Pearl
University of Oregon

Well, I was supposed to comment on Dr. Bouldings' speech. I thought it was a very bad speech -- I thought it was silly and superficial; but it was so much superior to Wayne Booth's speech that I'd rather talk about that instead. There are certain things that get me up tight, and one of the things is some pompous ass who's never tried it himself, talking about the need for critical thinking. Such a person says he can't understand an assistant professor insisting that somebody should be kept in on a political basis while somebody else should be fired on a political basis. Why is that difficult to understand, especially today? How can anyone insist that the university, or a college, or for that matter anything in this world is a politically neutral entity? Nobody, even as badly educated as a Dean at the University of Chicago, could be that ignorant. He must have at least read Ridgeways' book; or he must have read Noam Chomsky; or he must have read something. I feel much about him as the trustee said prior to the appointment of Dean Griswold to be president of Yale: "I could vote for him if he did only two things." And when asked what those two things were, he said, "Any two things." I would feel better about Dean Booth if he would read two things -- any two things.

It's an absurdity to consider anything politically neutral. Dean Booth demonstrated further naivete when he discussed a student who ran to him all agitated without first of all determining whether there was basis in fact in the rumor that some students might be arrested. Dean Booth forgets that this wasn't an academic research problem, this was a problem of somebody's livelihood or liberty being jeopardized. Obviously in this instance precaution has top priority now. It was also at a time in history where police on campus is not that rare or odd.

Now, I come to you very clearly as an advocate; I'm one of those kooks that believe in things. I think that the only way we're ever going to have a college or a university or anything else is when advocates get together and have at each other. There's no way that one's going to be taught to think critically; you're only going to think critically when you're confronted. And the university has been a place where we've denied confrontation. You can go back to Abelard and talk about disputation -- and probably end up the same way Abelard did -- or you can continue to have nice, precious, saccharin, sterile institutions where we will prate on about how we're going to learn to think critically.

Booth quotes Eldridge Cleaver -- Eldridge Cleaver wrote a very powerful book which I think everybody should have read, Soul On Ice -- but he fails to quote from what I think is the most important essay in the book, "The White Race and Its Heroes." He also fails to point out the most important thing of all -- where is Eldridge Cleaver today, in this "politically neutral" society? And what happened when a "politically neutral" university decided to let him teach a course? And what happened to the students that want to get credit for that course? The failure to recognize all of this, coupled with an insipid stupidity, gets us in the mess that we're in and will certainly never get us out of it. The reason we're in trouble in elementary school and everywhere else is that we are afraid to confront each other.

The school at every level is a sterile place: there is no intellectual debate going on anywhere, from pre-school to graduate school. And every effort to try to stimulate debate is smoothed over by that meringue that we just heard -- "First, think critically." That's not a prerequisite, that's the goal that comes out of certain kinds of crucibles. Critical thinking is never going to happen as long as the elementary school teacher is denied any opportunity of confrontation. Debate can start only after we recognize that the first and foremost ingredient of an educated man today is that he's a political man and he no longer needs to deny the fact. Either he is a political man or he's a tool of somebody else that is. And everywhere we go, that's the battle we've got to fight -- the right to be political. Only then will we begin to talk about critical thinking; only then will we have the arena from which critical thinking can emerge.

Go into any elementary school in this country and you will find denied that which is essential for political behavior in a democratic society, and that is rights. Schools must first become logically consistent with a democratic framework, there must be ground rules established to guarantee of student rights. At this present time students have no rights. From pre-school to graduate school, they have no rights.

It's still perfectly possible for kids to be thrown out of school because of the teachers' disapproval of the way they dress, or wear their hair. There's no such thing as due process. I have yet to be in an elementary school where I haven't heard a teacher say, "No one's going to leave this room until I find out who threw that spitball," which is based on the Nazis' response to the city of Lidice -- they were going to hold the whole town hostage until they find out who killed Heinrich. And then, when I talk to a group of teachers or prospective teachers who are going to be in elementary school they say to me, "Oh, we'll fight for our students' rights," I say, "What rights have you got?" What rights do you have? Suppose that a teacher doesn't like you and flunks you; what kinds of grievance procedures are available to you? Suppose you take on the teachers in class and call them asses (which, at a one per

106

cent level of competence, is probably legitimate); what happens to you then? Suppose you start looking at that institution and say, "Look at its prevailing racist attitudes. Look at admission standards." These same teachers had nothing to say. I don't believe it is possible for people to fight for others' rights who will not fight for their own.

To go on -- last week that great and eminent scholar S. I. Hayakawa, a "liberal, reflective man," pointed out in a speech, which got a standing ovation from the largest crowd that ever assembled in the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, that he was opposed to the Black Students Association's demand for unlimited admission because he wanted those students who worked very hard and got good grades to be rewarded. That was an out-and-out racist statement. He was concerned about the standards of San Francisco State. Any institution of higher learning that allows a two-bit intellectual like S. I. Hayakawa to act as its president has hit rock bottom: it has no standards. The second you set up admission standards that are based on crude race, class and ethnic bases, all you're doing is perpetuating the worst aspects of our society. And you make it impossible for free intellectual discussion to occur. When will it be possible for you to confront an Eldridge Cleaver and help him with his critical thinking, if you deny him access to your institution? And that happens in every single elementary school as well as every university.

What we do more and more is put our hands over our ears and say, "We aren't going to hear those things that we don't want to hear, because we're critical thinkers." And somehow, in a vacuum, insulated and isolated from ourselves, we think knowledge is going to come to us like Venus on the half shell. And it isn't. There are certain kinds of elemental truths that even people who teach elementary school teachers should know: as long as they maintain the sterile, barren kinds of atmospheres that they have maintained, as long as they are afraid to get out to where it's really happening, as long as they're unwilling to recognize what's relevant and what's irrelevant and make some commitment and stand in there and battle, as long as every class is a place where there's no debate, it's never going to happen! There is a total absence of debate, and there are reasons for it. We ought to understand those reasons and take a critical analysis of our society and begin to talk about where we have to go. Of course we don't have infinite knowledge, and never will. But we should be able to say what is necessary to attain those goals, given the state of the art. And we ought to be able to find some sort of an evaluation system to determine whether or not we're moving in that direction.

One of those goals has to be, in a free society, that every person has a wide range of choice now and is going to earn a living. You can't have freedom without some choice as to how you're going to earn a living. That's a problem that John Holt and Edgar Friedenburg have: they don't understand that. But if you're poor you understand that; if you're black or brown you understand that. You understand it's a "credential society". In order to get any kind of job at all in that credential society, you need many years of formal training. You have to go through twelve years of irrelevance to be eligible for four years of irrelevance to be eligible for one to two more years of irrelevance in order to have any choice. Every year a black kid stays in school in this country he loses money, short of getting a college degree; if he drops out in the eighth grade he'll make more lifetime earnings than if he stays to the third year of college. And yet we continue to throw out those slogans, "Stay in School," "Don't Be a High School Dropout." We even get James Brown to sing it to the kids. *But there's no future in a high school diploma*. Mr. Hayakawa isn't going to let them in his urban situated college. Nobody in this room is raising those questions. They're going to sit back and talk about it; and I'm going to make it quite clear that if you don't do at least that, you're doing nothing.

A second goal of a free society is that *you know you have rights*. That college student wouldn't come in scared to death that somebody would be arrested if he knew that that couldn't happen; that that university was a sanctuary; that no licensed policeman would be there. He had a basis for his fears. The illogic of that assistant professor wouldn't be that illogical if he felt that it was possible for the university to be a politically neutral place where there were rights guaranteed to all. But that defies everything we know. We are here to start recognizing that there are certain kinds of realities: denial of rights is one of them -- it must be rectified. That's not the only thing: we have to have more than rights, we have to have access to power. We have to be able to influence changes. We have got to be involved in all of the legislative, executive and judicial decision-making that effects us. We have to share in it. Not only are we denied that power, we don't evend demand it. There are precious few schools preparing elementary teachers that have students on their curriculum committee; that have students on their faculty selection committee; that have students on their search committee for their deans; nor do those students later go out and offer the same kind of opportunities for important decision-making to *their* students.

I was working with a high school in which ninety per cent of the students are black, and ten per cent of the faculty. There have been a lot of problems with communication between the faculty and the students (and there's a twenty-five per cent turnover in the faculty every year). The students came up with a very simple demand. What they wanted to do was interview the prospective teachers prior to their being hired.

They didn't ask to have veto power; all they asked was, "Let's interview them and see if we can make it with them, and we'll give you that information so that when your personnel committee decides, they'll have that information." We met with the faculty and we presented it to them. The response was, "We're professionals! What right do students have to judge professionals?" I said, "Doctors are professionals and sick people choose them. Lawyers are professionals and crooks choose them. And all these people want to do is give you some hint of how you're going to make it with them." They said, "No." So the students closed the school down; the principal and five teachers were forced to leave the school. What other alternative did the students have? They tried to negotiate, and they were very reasonable. They were met with non-negotiability on the part of people like us. How could we have taught them better to think critically?

Another thing we'd better start doing is start turning people on intellectually so they really deal with important issues. The most important issue facing our country is the Black-White confrontation. Don't talk about a human experience until first you talk about what we are going to do about the Black-White confrontation. How do we go about establishing an approach to language and to history that enables people to be individuals, to have some identity to communicate with those differing in concerns, tempo, style and sense of rage? What we have done in schools is to demand a language that is fraudulent and dreary and imprecise. Orwell in a very important essay called "Politics and the English Language" pointed out that while it's true that bad thought corrupts language, it's equally true that bad language corrupts thought.

One hundred and thirty-one years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson said before Phi Beta Kappa, "Everybody knows how much more powerful the language of the street is than the language of the academy. The language of the street is alive. Cut those words and they bleed, they run and they walk. They're vascular. Moreover, they that speak them have an eloquence; theirs is the shower of bullets, whereas Cambridge (Harvard) men and Yale men repeat themselves and apologize every half sentence."

In the last one hundred and thirty-one years only two things have happened: the language of the street has gotten better, and the language of the academy has gotten worse. If you don't believe me, try to stay awake when somebody reads a paper at a professional meeting. The language of the academy is devoid of affect. If you display any feeling in a meeting with professionals or academics, people walk out of the room. They can't stand it. But language devoid of affect is a phony language. If you can't express how you feel, if you're told you have to be polite, if the questions of the structure of the language are more important than the content of the language, no communication can ever take place.

We spend great numbers of years crippling our people in school. The scholars want people to learn about Shakespeare. Yet in the same schools where elementary school teachers teach, they forget that one thing very crucial about Shakespeare was that he couldn't spell. His spelling was idiosyncratic: he never spelled the same word the same way twice. One of the real reasons that he has trouble convincing historians that he existed is that he never spelled Shakespeare the same way twice. I could see poor old Shakespeare in elementary school in this country: by the time he got through the fourth grade he would be finished. He would have had returned to him papers literally bleeding with red pencil: "misspelled, misspelled, misspelled, misspelled! 'To be or not to be' -- isn't there a less awkward way of putting that?"

Not only do we deny students an opportunity to express themselves, but we also saddle them with lies. We spend a lot of time lying to kids about their history, distorting it to a point where they're absolutely crippled.

Dr. Boulding points out that if everybody above the age of thirty died, there would be no learning, there would be no transmittal to the youth; he implied that that would be a terrible thing. Now, I'm sure that it would create some problems, but there would also be some benefits derived: for one, we would probably not have taught all our kids to be racists. They have learned to be racists in schools. And how did they learn to be racists? We distorted every aspect of history. We have lied to them right along. We have minimized the fact that this was a nation that practiced slavery. (It's no accident that Gone With the Wind is making its annual return now: we need to bring Hattie McDaniels back.) We minimize the fact that this was a nation that practiced genocide and wiped out whole Indian nations. In fact, even the term "Indian," only came about because Columbus didn't know where he was. We have practiced wars of aggression. All of this is kept from the American people and the students.

We don't even analyze those aspects of racism that pervert and corrupt our society right now. Consider the fact that such a small percentage of the people in this room come from minority groups excluded from the mainstream. That's no accident. What are you going to do about that? Is there ever going to be a confrontation of Black and White? Is there going to be any real opportunity for elementary schools to deal with the fact that we have very very few Blacks in the classroom teaching, or that we have very few Mexicans in the classroom teaching, or that we have very few Indians in the classroom teaching? And of course we want them to teach -- "if only they were qualified." How do they become qualified? They're subjected to four or five more years of racist education. And then when we think we've whitened them up enough, we certify them.

Now those are grim realities. You don't want to hear them. But the answers are not that hard to come by. In one of the last essays that Richard Wright wrote, "Listen, White Man," he points out in the preface that he thinks that everybody really knows what has to be done. They just don't want to do it. We certainly know much more now about what has to be done, and we don't want to do it. We know. And it's very comfortable to come here and go through a series of irrelevancies at a high level and then go back to our institutions and have the same stupid courses, the same lack of honest admission policies, the same lack of opportunity for really honest discourse, the same kinds of discrimination in financial assistance that lock out the poor, who cannot possibly get through college. It costs a lot of money to go through college, and it takes longer to get that credential; and the only kinds of adequate assistance programs that we now have are for the graduates -- the NDEA Institutes and things of that nature -- not for the undergraduates. Next year there's going to be a twenty per cent cutback in Educational Opportunity Grants, rather than an increase. If you aren't prepared to act politically on that, then you are hypocrites.

I've talked about three of the things that we have to do if we're going to have better education -- we must become political, we must open up the opportunities for true occupational choice, we must become culturally sophisticated (which starts with allowing others to have a language and a history of their own). The fourth thing is that we must learn how to live with each other. And the only way we're going to learn how to live with each other is when we begin to confront each other honestly. It can start here, and it can start anywhere else. It is hard to tell the truth, because there are so many things that have happened in our society which make truthful confrontation even more difficult; let me just mention one of those things which makes it difficult. We have become a non-redemptive society. While all the things I've said about the past are true -- that this was a nation that practiced slavery, and genocide, and wars of aggression, and had robber barons who exploited the poor people -- it had one advantage: it was inefficient. This meant that one could always start again. The whole country was started by the scum of Europe. When they loused up in the East, they killed a few Indians and went West. When they loused up again they went further West. It's true that Wyatt Earp was wanted for murder in one town and was the sheriff of the next.

But now it's a non-redemptive society. We are now very vulnerable; our enemies that can hurt us. We have very efficient record-keeping systems now, beautiful data banks with instant retrieval. If in the first grade you are labelled as a slow reader, that stays with you the rest of your life; if you are labelled as an emotionally disturbed kid, it stays with you the rest of your life; if you express political unorthodoxy, it is remembered the rest of your life; if you commit a crime, it is on your record for the rest of your life. And that makes us very cautious. But we have to begin to deal with redemptiveness, and really begin to confront each other and be honest and force each other to be accountable. I've made a lot of statements: force me to be accountable, force me to back those statements up.

That's the essence of the whole game of critical thinking -- once you make up a statement, you are forced to defend it; but with the understanding that the critic takes on the same responsibility. He is also willing to be accountable for his criticism of you. That's the way the game must go down. We are now challenged to redeem ourselves from the morass that we have created. We must go now and take leadership in the school: We to do this must become something other than intellectual sloths, we must express affect, exhibit courage, provide direction.

If you think my points of reference are wrong, let's consider them. Let's talk about whether or not we can ignore work because we're going to make it obsolete. I don't think we can, but it makes a good debate. If you think you can do it with traditional economic means (and by traditional I mean Keynesian), if you think there's a way of generating full employment by manipulation of interest and tax structures, let's debate that. Let's debate every single thing that we have between us in a spirit of accountability, and let's define the ground rules. Not that I define my logic to you, but that we each define our logic to one another.

I sound angry and I am angry. And if you're not angry I think there's something wrong. We run our school systems the way the airlines run their airplanes: if you really want to go somewhere, you'll find out the system won't get you there; if the system will take you there, you find out the price is very high; and then if you're willing to pay the price and have agreed on a destination, they put you somewhere else. We have to change this. And it is not too difficult to decide where we have to begin: it might as well begin now and in this room.

107-109

Right Causes, Wrong Methods: A Case of Ineffective Advocacy

by Ronald L. Cramer
Tri-University Project Participant
Oakland University

If Mr. Pearl had started his speech in the same fashion in which he ended it and if he had stuck to the principle of accountability he outlines at the end of the speech,then there would be no need for me to write this statement. Pearl says, near the end of his speech, "I've made a lot of statements: force me to be accountable, force me to back those statements up. That's the essence of the whole game of critical thinking -- once you make a statement, you are forced to defend it; but with the understanding that the critic takes on the same responsibility." If Pearl had operated upon the premises he outlines he would have made a much different speech. He fails, however, to adhere to this very fine ideal of accountability. His concluding remarks give one the impression that reasoning together is a pretty fair way of going about things. Yet his preceding statements appear to be based upon the notion that confrontation and denunciation is what is wanted -- not reasoning.

The fact that his speech violates his own rule of accountability (while disturbing in itself) is not the thing that disturbed me the most. What bothers me most is that I sensed a certain phoniness about the whole speech: phony anger; phony analogies; phony evidence. I got the impression that he was putting on a show in order to demonstrate his liberal credentials, his love for liberal causes, his adherence to the rhetoric of the New Left. I sensed that in order to verify his credentials he regarded it necessary to castigate and villify Mr. Booth and Mr. Boulding. Had he produced sufficient evidence to support his denunciation and indulged less frequently in ad hominem argumentation I would have found his talk more credible, for he does make a number of points with which I am in agreement.

Pearl accuses Booth of insisting that a university or college is politically neutral; a careful reading of Booth's speech indicates that he made no such statement. I suspect that Pearl derived this notion through selective listening and that his psychological set predisposed him to misinterpret any pronouncements made by someone identified with the university administrative establishment. Booth was merely saying that some sort of coherently related criteria should be applied to any decision making process. He was calling for a fair standard of judgment in matters involving critical thinking. To illustrate what happens when arbitrary, inconsistent and unrelated criteria are applied to a problem Booth gave two illustrations. Both illustrations were derived from situations arising out of faculty and student protests.

The first illustration involved a certain faculty member who had accused university officials of using political reasons for not rehiring a certain controversial faculty member. In the same speech the same faculty member then urged the university officials to rehire her because preference should be given to the New Left. This idea suggests, on the one hand, that politics is an inappropriate criterion when it doesn't fit one's purposes but, on the other hand, politics is an appropriate criterion when it suits one's purposes. I don't think one can properly infer from this illustration that Booth was suggesting that universities should be politically neutral.

Pearl further reproves Booth for his second illustration regarding a student who had felt compelled to spread a rumor without checking on the veracity of the rumor. Booth felt that the student should have attempted to verify his hearsay evidence before spreading it as factual information. Pearl defends the student's actions by suggesting that the student was not engaged in an academic research problem but rather was on the firing line preventing someone's livelihood or liberty from being jeopardized. Pearl seems to imply that the proper thing to do in this case was to take immediate action (spread the rumor) and then find out later whether the action was justified and the facts accurate. At least, that is how I read him; if I read him wrongly, he lacks clarity. Granted that if one suspects the house is on fire from having smelled smoke it would seem a bit academic to carry out an extensive research project to be certain as to the source of the odor. However, the situation that Booth described didn't appear to be an emergency of quite the catastrophic proportions that Pearl implies. Surely a brief time spent in verifying the facts wouldn't have jeopardized anyone's livelihood or liberty. In fact, the student did take the opportunity to verify his information immediately after he had spread the rumor. Booth was simply saying that a critical man, a logical man, a just man, a fair man would require some verification of the facts before taking action. Somehow to my simple mind this seems eminently appropriate. Perhaps I fail to understand the higher principles of revolutionary logic.

I find it a bit ironic that Pearl should refer to Booth as a "pompous ass," and "ignorant man," a "badly educated man," in view of the fact that both men made an insistent plea for critical judgment and the use of a standard of accountability. Pearl says, "I've made a lot of statements: force me to be accountable, force me to back those statements up." This can be nothing other than a demand for the exercise of critical judgment and for evidence to support one's critical judgments. Booth expresses almost precisely the same conviction when he describes educated behavior as, "First, and most obviously, maybe even finally, it is the habit of questioning what other men say, of looking them in the eye and demanding, 'What's your evidence?' " If Pearl and Booth do not differ significantly in their convictions regarding critical judgment and accountability then why the ad hominem attacks? Why the phony anger?

I have said earlier that I agreed with a number of the ideas that Pearl expressed. Pearl said that students have no rights in our schools today. I believe there is substantial evidence to support the notion that students possess very few substantive rights. I agree with his notion that teachers frequently fail to stand up and demand their rights. Only recently have a few teachers recognized the need for organized teacher unions to demand these rights. Pearl says that our institutions are racist. This cannot be denied. He indicates, and I agree, that one of the goals of this country is a free society where every person has a wide range of choice in how he is going to earn a living. There cannot be freedom when some are denied access to the type of educational experiences that would qualify them to gain the job they seek. I don't accept, however, Pearl's notion that the solution to this problem is to dismantle the credential system of our society. What is needed is not to destroy the credential concept in order to insure a man the right to earn a living. Rather, what is needed is the certain opportunity for every man to gain whatever a credentialling society requires, as long as there are meaningful guarantees that arbitrary discriminatory and unfair credentialling standards are not imposed.

There is one final point with which I wish to take exception. I take exception because the point illustrates what I consider to be part of the phony rhetoric which purports to find analogies where no proper analogy exists. Pearl describes the lack of student freedom in a high school where the students had evidently asked for an opportunity to interview prospective teachers prior to hiring. The student's opinions and consequent recommendation would then be passed on to the hiring committee who would make the final decision. The students were denied this right and I would agree with Pearl that the denial was improper. I believe, along with Pearl, that teachers and administrators should encourage students to involve themselves meaningfully in such matters instead of jealously guarding traditional prerogatives. In spite of my agreement with the idea I am convinced that Pearl used a superficial and inappropriate analogy to buttress his argument.

Pearl's idea might have been strengthened if he had simply argued that teachers and administrators should be willing to share some of their traditional responsibilities simply because it is the right and wise thing to do in these changing times. Instead he resorted to a phony analogy by suggesting that this same concept is accepted in other professions. His analogy went like this: "Doctors are professionals and sick people choose them. Lawyers are professionals and crooks choose them." We are left to assume, therefore, that if teachers were professionals they would allow students to choose them (i. e. hire them or have some voice in hiring them). But the analogy doesn't apply. He's saying that a sick person choosing a doctor (in a patient-doctor relationship) is equivalent to a student choosing (hiring) a teacher. When a patient chooses a doctor, he is not participating in the medical profession's hiring and firing procedures. These procedures are set by the medical profession and by its definitions of medical ethics, medical malpractice and so forth. When sick people choose a doctor they are not deciding whether the doctor should become a staff member of the local hospital. Sick people choosing their doctor (patient-doctor relationship) and students choosing (hiring) their teachers are not analogous relationships. The analogy in the student world to "choosing a doctor" may be "electing a course" because of respect for, or trust in, a teacher. In any case, Pearl's analogy is inappropriate.

* * *

Boulding's Human Appeal

There is something about Mr. Boulding's speech that is more significant than its intellectual appeal. The sentiments of the speech appeal to the affective domain of one's mind. Mr. Boulding calls upon education to take unto itself the Herculean labor of molding the human identity in order to cement the fabric of our divided society. Educators can be assigned no higher or more difficult a task.

It must be admitted that Mr. Boulding's words are readily subject to misinterpretation, particularly by those who prefer the revolutionary rather than the evolutionary tactic of bringing about change in our society. Blacks may justifiably feel that Boulding's call to ride the evolutionary rather than the revolutionary process is just another attempt to withhold the rights they have been so long denied. Blacks rightly feel they have been patient long enough. Yet, his admonition to choose the evolutionary rather than the revolutionary path strikes me as both thoughtful and realistic. It is thoughtful because it calls upon blacks and whites to recognize their common humanity. It is realistic because it is the process most likely to bring about long-term gains for minority cultures.

Boulding proclaims that, "Racial differences are too trivial to build an identity around." If this statement is considered in the context of the entire speech it may be regarded as basically sound. The context reveals that Boulding was stressing the need for the recognition of a human identity as the common rallying point around which the diverse elements of our culture can be bound together.

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that the statement can also be taken to mean that blacks (and other ethnic groups) should not concern themselves with establishing their racial uniqueness through black studies and other means. I am convinced that this was not Boulding's intention. Actually he has stressed the usefulness of black studies although he sees them as being more effectively and appropriately implemented outside of the educational establishment. I would disagree with Boulding on this matter. The present societal situation requires the incorporation of black studies into the structure of the educational curriculum at all levels. Boulding's disagreement, it should be noted, is one of method rather than a substantive quarreling with the goal of establishing racial identity. This sentiment is revealed in his statement that, "I'm all in favor of a 'mosaic society.' I don't want everybody to be homogeneous...I want to have a society in which there are pink people, yellow people, black people, and Seventh Day Adventists, and Communists, and Buddhists and the whole gamut of human variety. I don't want a uniform society at all. On the other hand, if we're going to have a mosaic society, it has to be set in some kind of cement. You have to have a frame to put the mosaic in and cement to hold the pieces together. This cement is the human identity."

Mr. Pearl evidently thought that this advice was foolish, for he characterized Boulding's speech as "bad," "silly," and "superficial." Anyone who has read both speeches may judge for himself whether Pearl was referring prophetically to his own speech or Mr. Boulding's. If Pearl had listened carefully and thought critically (as he enjoined us all to do) he would have recognized the redemptive features in Mr. Boulding's speech. Pearl has made the mistake common to passionate and devoted men who have espoused a political-humanitarian cause. He fails to recognize the redemptive features of Boulding's argument, I believe, because he differs with Boulding's methodology for bringing about social change. Pearl is basically a revolutionary whereas Boulding is an evolutionist. This is an important difference but not a totally irreconcilable one. Pearl's rhetoric is geared to confrontation; Boulding's is geared to reconciliation. Boulding's sentiments are the necessary corrective to the kind of over-confrontation that passionate and devoted men, such as Pearl, are likely to indulge in. I suspect that Pearl tends to overgeneralize and overreact to ideas and ideals that are not couched in the fiery rhetoric of the revolutionist. Partially, of course, the difference also lies in notions about how to arouse an audience -- the more passionate and challenging the rhetoric the more likely you are to get a response -- even if the response is a negative one.

I suspect that another reason Pearl characterized Boulding's speech as superficial was that Pearl may have understood Boulding to deny the validity of racial identity. But Boulding did not say this. Boulding was saying, and with this I agree, "Racial pride is not the substance that binds us together at the highest level -- the level at which we all participate commonly -- the human level." Can anyone seriously deny the validity of that appeal?

A. The Poor Cow -- The Teacher As Forgotten Man In Contemporary Educational Reform

(An analysis of the impossibility of reform without the radical restructuring of the educational establishment)

Lawrence York
Chico State College
Chico, California

When I arrived at the Tri-University Project's New Orleans Conference I discovered that I had been "placed" with the group on creativity, a subject about which I presume to know very little. Since I knew Paul Olson quite well and he knows that my interests lie more in the direction of language development in small children, community action and community schools, I felt that I was in with the wrong group but I decided to stick around for a while and then move on and listen to someone like Donald Smith talk about community schools. Mr. Summerfield, the chairman of the group, asked if there were anyone present who did not feel comfortable in a group discussing creativity. I responded that there had been altogether too much talk and too little action concerning creativity. Torrance, Guilford and a host of others have produced definitions and studies on creativity, how important it is, how to recognize the creative potential and to foster it among students. I suggested that all this was very well, but that until teachers could work in an atmosphere different from the one in which they worked now, there would be little chance of creativity in the public school. Until the power structure changes and until teachers have something to say about school management and curriculum development, very little would happen that was either creative or imaginative.

The discussion wandered, over the course of the morning. Some suggested that we define creativity so that we knew what we were talking about. Others suggested we not define it at all, since that had already been done. During the afternoon session the discussion wandered even farther afield to school problems, problems with taxpayers, textbooks, projects, learning theories, legislation. The group seemed to agree that creativity, loosely defined as "imaginative, flexible, innovative behavior," took place in the classroom when certain conditions existed: openness, tolerance, and an ability to handle novelty, but that most schools presented an almost insurmountable barrier to the development of creativity. Unless teachers could be trained, we all said, to be flexible, imaginative, and open, there was little hope for improvement.

What had happened in the course of their training which prohibited teachers from acting the way we now wanted them to act? Quite obviously, they had attended our schools and our colleges, and they had suffered for it. They have attended schools all their lives and now they were in the public schools doing the things they had seen done all their lives. They responded to authority the way they had been taught to respond. (If they didn't they were punished). When college professors told them something was right, they realized they must agree or fail. When they went to teach in the public school they were given a set of textbooks (a curriculum) in which they had no say, a management structure in which they have no say, and they are expected to cope in order that the children learn something, master some sort of manageable product and pass tests. The tragedy is that traditional academic structures have never come to grips with education as a process, and still deal with it as product. Now that the product seems to be inferior we are told to alter the production line. Dick Foster says the repair syndrome won't work with kids. It won't work with teachers either.

Academics have discovered that teachers and schools are terrible. Academics blame teachers for the poor quality of the schools and, like administrators, take credit for those schools which are "good," (either productive or imaginative.) They ought to blame themselves.

They (academicians) now want to free children to learn, but they don't seem to be able to free themselves and they definitely are unwilling to free teachers. Teachers who criticize the new teacher training programs (which attempt to substitute transformational grammar for traditional grammar but treat both as a product to be pumped into teachers) are treated in the same manner (contemptuously) as teachers who criticized older and more traditional programs: father knows best. Program administrators who are now more willing to listen to community action groups from the ghettos are still unwilling to listen to teachers. Teachers are seen as technicians, to be bypassed, and material is designed to be teacher proof by publishers and even by transformationalists. I heard a man at a conference in the spring of 1968 describe a project in which he had spent three years working to train a group of teachers to teach certain concepts of transformational grammar. The teachers had not mastered it sufficiently, he said, and so when they tried to use it in the schools it had not worked. Was he deterred? Did anybody ask why he bothered? No. He would persist with the project, he said. He felt that it was of the utmost importance to get teachers to do what he did. This unfortunate paradigm is the bane of our new educational reform. We in the university have discovered new knowledge. We know it is important because it is what we do. We assume everyone else will accept its inherent relevance. We are angry when they do not. When we bring teachers back to the university and they balk at what we do, we blame them. We go through our joyless exercises in analysis, irrelevance, silly grammatical exercises.

Teachers ask, "Why is this important to little children?" They ask, "Have you ever taught little children?" The questions are ignored. Father knows best. Mind your manners.

It would be funny or only pathetic if it weren't so tragic. Given what we know about humanistic psychology and about self-fulfilling and self-defeating prophesies, it is amazing that government projects and teacher training programs are attempting to develop imaginative, creative, independent teachers by using traditional, unimaginative mandarin-oriented programs which do nothing but solidify the already paleolithic pecking order, and which are generally subject-matter oriented. Programs are staffed by people who have never learned how to listen to anyone but other academicians. Ernie Chambers said at Minneapolis that there is honor among thieves (teachers) who protect their own against all attacks. The same is true of university faculties who not only protect their own but refuse to listen to outsiders at all. In the Introduction to A Pride of Lions Paul Olson describes the first round of projects and proposals which were submitted to the National Advisory Committee for the TTT and about which he says the following: "None of the sixty-five institutions of Higher Education which submitted program plans chose to include in the planning of programs the 'communities' which the programs planned to 'serve'."

It might be important, even necessary, to gain the political support of the universities in America if one is going to reform public education. They wield great power. But a university classroom is a hell of a place to start a revolution in teaching. It's the wrong place because little teaching has gone on there in our century, if ever. Getting a faculty to change its way of doing things is like moving a graveyard. I would contend that if higher institutions plan to be of service to the educational community as well as to the disadvantaged that they learn to listen to the educational community in the public school, and that they provide their services by getting out of what are essentially monastic institutions and into the schools to act as consultants, to engage in teaching (perhaps so they might understand better how they have failed utterly to be relevant to an entire culture), and so that they might learn to treat elementary teachers as colleagues rather than as slaves. To paraphrase Jerry Farber ("The Student as Nigger", L. A. Free Press, May 1967) the teacher is still the "nigger" in American public education; and teacher training programs are still the ghetto. Teachers are beginning to develop their own "community-action" programs by joining the Union. For better of for worse (and unionism might just be for the worse) teachers are moving toward a revolt in order to gain the "clout" which other power groups seem to be gaining through militancy instead of through reason.

Until there is some radical restructuring of teacher education programs, there is little hope for reform in education. Until teachers are treated as colleagues (whether they deserve it or not) by college professors, there will be no real communication between universities and schools. Until college professors stop seeing teachers as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge, neither professors nor teachers will come to grips with process instead of product. Until university faculty and teachers learn to deal with each other honestly and openly, in an atmosphere of shared trust and responsibility, there will be no creativity, reform or improvement in education at any level. Until teacher training programs move out into the public schools where they belong, and college people go to those schools, bringing their information, their libraries and their theories to offer as resources, not as dogma, there will be few meaningful changes in public education at any level, except those produced by the students themselves. Current evidence seems to indicate that the only meaningful reforms possible are going to come from slave revolts and not from monolithic ossified structures. So be it.

B. Our Inability to See the Real

Lupe Castillo
Oakland Public Schools

I feel very angry over the way the audience reacted to some of the speeches, in particular to Dr. Pearl's speech; many of the people did not want even to hear him, and I think they turned him off. They tuned out. They were there in body only but did not really listen to what he had to say. And as soon as Dr. Pearl ended his speech, people got up and left and there was absolutely no reaction from many of us. As a junior high school teacher, I feel the teachers have to become human and have to listen.

It is almost analagous to the problems that are going on in the schools, at least in the schools around me, in Oakland, where I see the teachers talking to and at the youngsters instead of talking with the youngsters. I come from the Bay area, where I see things happening constantly. I see a building going up in flames next to me, or I see youngsters on drugs or I see junior high youngsters pimping for prostitutes.

People left feeling that this was a good conference. It depends on what you mean by a good conference. If a good conference means that everything ran according to schedule, everything ran smoothly, we met our schedules and speakers arrived on time, or we heard speakers who gave a nice talk and saw people who reacted by standing up and applauding, or by not applauding, or by not listening, or by not even staying for a speech, then our purpose was achieved. But there was very little interaction.

In most cases, the administrators remained together, the scholars usually remained together, the various school officials kept to themselves, the university participants formed their own groups -- even the few representatives of various ethnic groups tended to polarize themselves. It is because they feel insecure that people tend to remain together; at education conferences, of all places, this should not be! How will the academic people learn from the classroom teachers, the community representatives, etc.? People from one ethnic group (or cause or interest) should be mixed within other groups of scholars who need an education and exposure to all walks of life. If, for some reason, this is impossible, we should get a panel (with all viewpoints represented) before the entire assembly -- maximum exposure for all. Then, with clever handling, there just might be a reaction from the floor -- the director of the conference should anticipate questions from the audience, even if the schedule is disrupted, even if the program has to be revised -- because by then the conference will have become ALIVE, people will have become stimulated, irritated, etc. But the conference will then be meeting the needs of most of the participants. And what had not been said previously, just might be said before the entire group! When a conference becomes alive, when there is a "give and take" among all participants, when conclusions are reached by all those attending, when recommendations are finally made, and when steps are taken to implement the said recommendations -- then one might call it a "good conference."

The conference's failure to develop an atmosphere where people could participate was also something that I felt within the small group sessions: each of us represented a different level in education and there was little effort to really bring us together; no one seemed to really care. We were not a team, a unit, working together, involved with one another -- we were just bodies occupying chairs.

Many of us who were from institutions of higher learning were not concerned with the "problems" of minority youngsters and their families. One had only to look at the facial expressions to see this. The professionals either dismissed the minority-group representatives, or they simply were incapable of accepting and/or acknowledging "our" presence. *Were they afraid of what they would hear*? In any case, I sensed a withdrawal, an inability to face reality, a reluctance to come down from that ivory tower to extend a helping hand *or* to accept an outstretched hand; I only hope that it is not too late for them to become human, truly human, as they attempt to train teachers to work with our youngsters.

The reaction at the conference of the people from Higher Education is a symbol of what is happening all over America in the schools.

In the Bay area, where I am working in a black school with black youngsters and youngsters who belong to other minorities (Spanish speaking students, etc.), I see teachers who are indifferent, apathetic, lethargic; to me they are dead wood; they should have been cut out years ago. But they are there. They draw their salaries. That is all they care about. I am sure the same thing is true of many of the participants who came to this conference. They came. They were not conquered.

When a teacher has a conference with a parent, whether it be at home, over the telephone, or at the school site, there is usually an exchange of thoughts, ideas, and facts which aid our attempts to diagnose the "problem" of the youngster; if there is real dialogue and a true interaction, if there is communication between a teacher and a parent -- then there develops a "give and take" attitude which results in both groups' making some kind of effort to help the troubled youngster. The pupil himself is often called in to discuss his concerns with parents and teachers. There is a three-way interaction. It is not enough to talk, to discuss, to exchange ideas, etc. -- some kind of step must be taken to begin the process of finding solutions to help the child.

In our group, a statement was made that some Spanish-speaking youngsters are almost falling off their back porches onto the school campus, yet they rarely reach college or finish their education. To this, I would reply: when ripe fruit falls from the tree to the ground, you may let it lie there -- to rot -- OR you may pick it up to enjoy it fully. On the other hand, when the fruit is not yet ripe but drops from its tree to the ground -- again, you may pick it up, carefully nourish it until it's ripe; this may take time, yes, but that fruit can be rescued, saved, until it is juicy, ripe, and full-grown. Too often, however, we allow this fruit to just lie there, green, unripe, on the ground -- until it rots away.

The involvement of students in helping, even at junior high level where I work, is suppressed. When youngsters are trying to participate in an activity, they become a part of that school, they feel they belong. When youngsters of a school go home and ask their parents also to participate and help out in a student activity at the school site, or within the community, the parents come forth, then the parents and the students feel that they belong and that they are doing something together within that school. School is for the student; schools are the people in the communities; the schools are for involvement of students in school functions. At the junior high level, where I work, students have a student government; but as long as administrators control the curriculum, as long as administrators control books, the selection of material, as long as they have the last word, the school is not fit for students. The students turn to something else that meets their needs -- in some cases violence, as in the Bay area.

For me the outstanding experience of the conference was the evening I spent at the "Caritas" Center -- a Montessori school, infant care center etc. located in the black ghetto and conducted by people who give all they have, in the way of material possessions, to their work. On this informal occasion, we mixed and became human; there I found the dedication, the firm convictions, the perseverance, and humility within individual educators -- something not evident during the Conference itself! It was not only the visit to this Center that taught me so much; it was also the interaction amongst those of us fortunate enough to be invited on the tour of the Desire black ghetto community. Wouldn't it have been better for all Conference participants to have gone on such a tour, in "mixed" groups, to have seen "where the action is", to have seen "what it is all about" -- to learn from each other, to learn how to work at the grass-roots level, to learn how to implement programs, instead of writing about them? Perhaps the very informality of this particular evening, plus the eye-opening "Caritas" Center and its work, is what, in the last analysis, finally made this a "good Conference" to me.

A conference ought to be productive: conclusions should be reached by the entire group assembled. There should be recommendations forthcoming, but there must be immediate steps taken to implement at least some of these recommendations. One should leave a conference feeling that not only were conclusions arrived and/or compromises made. One should feel that there will be some action taken immediately, as a direct result of the conference. A follow-up evaluation should be made so that we do more than record the proceedings of the conference. The evaluation should focus upon the progress and development of the recommendations which evolved from the conference.

C. Community Control and the TTT: A Correction

Charles R. Bruning

To the Tri-University Project:

This is the second year that I have attended the conferences of the Tri-University Project. I returned for the second year because I felt the first conference had a contribution to make to my professional awareness. The same can be said for this second conference. I appreciated it very much.

Even though I am grateful for the type of program that you had in New Orleans, I have a concern about a statement you made in the introductory comments in "A Pride of Lions."

The generalization about TTT planners' failure to include "community" involvement in the planning, execution, and control of TTT projects was essentially true, at least until the TTT National Advisory Committee made its May 15 recommendation in letters to TTT groups. There is, however, at least one exception. Contrary to the assertion underlined on page 6 of "A Pride of Lions," the proposal developed by the Minnesota TTT consortium included heavy community involvement long before the Tucson meeting of the TTT National Advisory Committee.

The following is a brief history of community involvement in the Twin Cities Triple T Project. All of the following material can be corroborated by examining the various stages of the Twin Cities proposal document or by checking with the individuals from the TTT National Advisory Committee who had contact with Twin Cities personnel.

Planning for active community involvement ("community" referring to central city residents -- not educators -- and representatives of non-educational community organizations) began in early March, immediately after the TTT workshop at Michigan State University, and it must be pointed out that the early TTT guidelines had not yet mentioned "communities."[1] These plans were mentioned to Dr. Nicholas Hook at the April 6 meeting in Chicago, as we were not certain that the National Advisory Committee would allow us to directly involve the central city community. Dr. Hook supported the idea at that time, adding that he did not know of any other TTT groups who were moving in that direction.

With Dr. Hook's encouragement in mind, a number of people with direct, active contact with the inner city communities in Minneapolis and St. Paul were invited to join the original TTT task force when Dr. James Tanner came to Minneapolis for the first site visit. At that meeting, April 15, more detailed plans for a community advisory committee were completed, and again we were told that other TTT groups were not planning direct community involvement. Most of these details were suggested by the Director of the Minneapolis Urban Coalition. At that point in the development of Twin Cities TTT plans, community involvement was viewed as including:

a. the formation of a community advisory committee, with representatives from both Minneapolis and St. Paul, to advise the TTT task force on the further development of a Twin Cities proposal.

b. the development by the community advisory committee of a section of the proposal dealing with TTT participant's interaction with community organizations and the establishment of regular channels, both formal and informal, for continued community input into the TTT project when it became operational.

c. establishing a mechanism which would place the responsibility for arranging and managing the "out-of-school" clinical experiences in the hands of community representatives.

On May 22, 1968, the first meeting of the community advisory committee was held. The members of that committee are listed in the original Twin Cities proposal. Several other meetings of that committee were held shortly thereafter. The first task of the committee was to establish the guidelines for the selection of community representatives to serve on the Twin Cities TTT Board, which will be described in more detail later. The second task assumed by members of that committee was to help plan and operate the summer pilot project, which began June 17, 1968, with ten teacher trainers participating in a five-week session.

---

[1] "And the communities they serve" was part of the first TTT guidelines [Ed. note].

Throughout the pilot project, participants met with a broad range of formal and informal community groups, including a number of inner city youth groups with which the TTT participants worked closely. Several inner city youths were hired to work with the pilot project as instructors. One of the participants, it should be added, was a teacher aide from the near North Side community, and this led to the inclusion of ten community people as regular participants in the proposed TTT project, since the summer program clearly demonstrated that community residents can and should play a greatly expanded role in teacher training.

Dr. William Rioux conducted the second Twin Cities site visit on June 19. Members of the community advisory committee attended that meeting, and the involvement of central city communities was discussed at some length.

Following the announcement that the Twin Cities TTT project would be funded, steps were immediately taken to implement the community advisory committee's plans for forming the TTT Board. The original TTT task force asked the community advisory committee to assume full responsibility for the selection of community representatives, and if major representation gaps are found, filling them will be the sole responsibility of the TTT Board. The Board is now formally constituted. Twenty of the thirty-three members are from the "community," and community involvement was further extended by one of the Board's first formal actions -- to expand the number of youth members from four to eight. At this point, nineteen members of the Board are black and two are Indian.

With this history in mind, we found the categorical statement in "A Pride of Lions" rather disturbing, since community involvement has always been a major feature of the Twin Cities project. Of course, it is far more disturbing that the statement was indeed so widely true.

II. Teachers and Education in an Oppressed Community:

Spanish People in California

The Tri-University project meeting at Minneapolis included discussions of Bi-Lingual, Bi-Cultural schools and of the meaning of the "community power" movement to education. The meeting included a representative of one sector of the American community which includes a sizeable number of Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surname people: i.e. Jim Drake of the Farm Workers Organizing Committee. The passage of the Bi-Lingual Education Act, the development of Bi-Lingual-Bi-Cultural Schools, and the community movement suggest that America may in the future anticipate something different in the education of Spanish speaking children or of children who emerge from a predominantly Hispanic-cultural tradition but who speak English. Jerry Brown of the Farm Worker's Group represented Mr. Drake at the New Orleans meeting.

The New Orleans committee was encouraged to discuss:

1. What industry and business need to do to help make decent education available to Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surname children.

2. What the home, the street, and the culture teach the Spanish-surname child as to what he is and what his world is about.

3. What modifications to Bruner's "seven dichotomies" would be in order for Spanish-surname kids, Spanish-speaking kids, or children of migrant farm workers.

4. What the facts are as to the economic conditions which create the misfittage between human learning and the economic system in the Spanish-surname community.

The sessions were recorded.

A. Spanish Small Group Discussion

Mr. Brown: I find education very hard to talk about in the context that I come from, the problems of just Mexican-Americans:

The farm worker, as you know, is excluded from every major piece of labor and welfare legislation -- not all welfare, but certain aspects of social security legislation, both at the state and the federal level. He is even excluded from the National Labor Relations Act, under which workers in industry can petition the board to have an election to see if the majority of the workers in that plant want a union. Farm workers have been excluded from this since 1935. Governor Wagner of New York wrote in his notes that the only way legislation for labor unions could be passed was to make the definition of an employee specifically exclude agricultural workers; this is the way it has been since that time. The same thing applies to a minimum wage, and to many aspects of workmen's compensation, disability insurance, etc. The agricultural business in California, and throughout the United States, has as one requirement a docile, cheap, and completely elastic labor force; this is what the rural interests have pressured for and been able to achieve.

Now in terms of the problem that we're dealing with; let me start off with this statement: when the farm worker tries to organize, (and I could say when poor people in general try to organize) we face an entire system which encourages men to be only half-human, which cripples their personalities, which destroys their pride and self-respect. I think Brother Smith was talking about those very same things. The first problem that we face in organizing is to make men proud of themselves. Poor people have developed a pattern of dealing with the dominant power, which is to evade it, to get around it, but not really to stand up on their feet and confront it.

Let me illustrate the extent of our difficulties. A movie was made of the Delano strike; one scene showed two busloads of strikebreakers being brought in from Mexico. One bus sped right through the stop sign of the picket line and the police who were there did nothing. At the next stop sign, the strikers sat down in the middle of the road and stopped the bus. Cesar Chavez, who is the director of the organization, just about breaks into tears every time he sees this scene in the movie, and all that it represents.

In my opinion, the institutions that deal with the farm workers -- welfare, the Immigration and Naturalization Services, the hospitals, and especially the schools -- are an adjunct to the labor force. *People don't have to drop out; they get pushed out*. So we have a system of continuation schools (which is where you end up if you're lagging behind in grades, if you're not paying attention, or if you 'disrespect' the teacher.) When you get put into that continuation school, you can only go three hours a day. And very curiously, in Delano as in other cities, about ninety per cent of the kids in the continuation schools are Mexican-American. It's the lowest rung of the track system. I could give you examples of welfare and the hospitals that also indicate that systems which supposedly serve the people are controlled by interests which are dedicated to keeping a massive, uneducated labor force.

Recently, in a survey of education for Mexican-American children, it was observed that teachers always chose non-Mexican kids for the leadership roles in the games that were played. The researchers then asked the teachers and the principals, "Why do you always put the Anglo kids in charge of every game you play?" The answer was, "Well, you realize that when these kids get out of school, the Anglos are going to be bosses of the Mexican kids. And so the kids might as well start learning now how to give orders and how to follow orders."

So Mexican-Americans -- and I'm not Mexican-American, but most of the people in our union are Mexican-American -- face a double problem: not only this battering of the personality and insistence on the inferiority of the Mexican-American, but also the double whammy, the linguistic one. Most of the people come from Spanish-speaking homes; and when they go to class, they're not allowed to speak Spanish. In fact, the kids get hit over the knuckles if they speak Spanish. Not only that, the girls in high school are discouraged from wearing their hair up in a fancy way or wearing frilly lace things. Their whole expression of their culture is suppressed. Even the physical contact, which Mexicans have naturally with each other, is suppressed.

But it is the language in particular which poses the biggest problem: if the teachers are not bilingual, (and most of them are not -- probably only one or two per cent of the teachers in the whole school system are Chicano or Mexican-American) then there is an enormous gulf between them and their students. The result is that people become mutilated as personalities and mutilated verbally; they can't speak Spanish well because they are not allowed to speak it in school; and they are not taught to read and write it. There is no recognition of the fact that this is the language that they learn in the home, the language which is their own. So a person who has studied Spanish in high school or college can write and read Spanish more correctly than the people who are living in the valley. And the people in the valley do not master English either. Without overcoming this, I do not see how there can be any education in any sense of the word.

We always talk about racism and oppression in terms of what it does to the minority group person -- what it does to the Mexican, what it does to the black person, what it does to the Puerto Rican. I think it is time for psychologists and educators to start looking at what racism has done to the white person in our system, because racism is a two-sided coin; the white person has not escaped and the teachers who are dealing with those students have not escaped from it either. Dr. Smith told us about what those teachers at that educational society meeting said: "Well, how can black be beautiful if white is beautiful?" Throughout the history of racism, it has been a two-sided coin. People are going to have to start looking at what racism has done to the white person and what his problems are, because racism is a white problem, not the minority group's problem. It becomes the minority group's problem in dealing with it.

I think we can make the hypothesis, that given a racist society minority groups will have to differentiate themselves from the rest of society in radical cultural ways when they strive to raise themselves as a group. This is really the only way to avoid the definitions and labels that society pins on people: they are "bad," they are "worthless," they are "no good." The first thing we must organize for is to change that definition. As organizers, we spent maybe eight years,before we could even call a strike, giving people a sense of their own worth as human beings. In this sense the problems of both the Chicanos and the blacks are the same; the solutions, though, will need to be handled differently because of the different natures of the language problem. On the one hand there is the Spanish language of the Mexican-Americans which must be respected and on the other, there has to be a place for the non-standard dialects (which are also, in a sense, another language) of black people.

So I think those are the three points that I wanted to make: let me try to make a resume. When farm workers -- and I would extend that to the poor people of minority groups -- try to organize in the United States, they are confronted not only by the economic power of the people who control the resources, but that economic power also controls the range of institutions that are ostensibly serving our communities. And poor people have been taught to fear and over-respect the institutions, so that they are unable to fight effectively.

Secondly, as we organize poor people from the minority groups, especially farm workers, we are going to have to make ourselves culturally distinctive. In other words, we are going to have to prove that we are different, by drawing on our different historical heritages. We need to do this in order to instill pride into people who have none. You cannot organize people who tell you, "I think what we're doing is right but I can't get up there and picket my boss's place. Any place else, but not my boss's." If a man cannot picket his boss's place, it means that he is not free; and we have to make people free. That is what organizing is about -- it's the first step in a long process.

And the third point was that we should identify ourselves in separate ethnic groups -- Spanish people, black, Puerto Rican. The fourth point, and I think perhaps one of the most important, is that maybe we should have OEO projects and Head Start for the white middle class people, because they're the ones who've been hurt in very bad ways by the racism of this society; I think the government should have some compassion, should realize that that part of the problem isn't solved, and should try to understand the teachers who are white and what they bring to their side of the racial relationship. If attention isn't given to this problem, and people don't start studying it and trying to deal with it on a human level, we'll only deal with one side of the coin.

Leonore Bravo: Recently at a conference in San Francisco someone from Boston brought up the point that we know all about our social problems and the solutions are fairly simple. But the community is not interested in having these solutions applied. This is what we are dealing with in California, certainly in the organization of farm workers. The problem is not a language problem and not a racial problem -- except that race and language have provided excuses for keeping people down -- it is a problem of economics. It is a matter of ensuring that poor people do not remain in a situation of self-perpetuating poverty.

The other thing that occurred to me is that projects for white middle class people are very good too. The Oakland hills and the Berkeley hills are full of really good, honest, sensitive people. If they could see what was going on down in the ghettos, they would be outraged. But they are ignorant; they don't know what is happening and they never will know, because they will never go down to where Miss Castillo teaches school, for example; they're never going to go down to that part of town. They won't even drive through it, let alone get in and see the social problems. It seems to me that the social problems relate to the lack of information and education of the middle class about the real nature of these problems. Just having the police between them and these other people is not a very good solution.

And the other thing is, giving to these people the right to a decent wage and to some degree of economic prosperity. I know the situation down in the Delano area very well, because when I was there some twenty-five years ago, we had the basis of what now is going on.

As far as language is concerned, the move to improve the bilingual program does not impress me at all. In the research which I was doing in Oakland, we had three populations of Mexican-American children: one of them was in an economically depressed area; one was in a middle class area; and one was in a heterogeneous area. They applied the bilingual program to the lowest of these three groups, and what was interesting to me was the psychological change in their personalities which made them more like the children in the middle group. The middle group couldn't speak Spanish. They were people whose parents were mechanics and who were well employed; they were completely integrated into the population at large.

The other thing is that immigrants coming here will learn English. Immigrant children learn English in eight months to a year if they are of normal intelligence, and they go on quite steadily through the school. I think that if we put the money that we're putting into the bilingual program into a social welfare program, into a program for helping the parents to achieve a better economic status, then we would do more for the children very quickly.

J. Wagner: I'm very much for the bilingual program as such, because I know that it's very important to be able to understand your own language fully; but the way in which the bilingual program is being handled now is very bad, because it does not include anything about cultural behavior patterns that the children could identify with and which could relate to the children's other problems. We've had a lot of success in a little poverty community in Berkeley by organizing all the forces. You've got to hit every level possible, and work with those lower-class Anglo teachers.

John Kleinert: In Miami, fifty per cent of the teachers on the staffs of the bilingual schools for Cuban youngsters are Cuban. This means that half of the school day is conducted in Spanish and is an acknowledgment of the culture of the students.

Jearnine Wagner: Last summer, we had a program in San Antonio, to which we brought teachers and people from all over Latin America. But still the rigid school patterns exist: I (the teacher) teach you (the child) some body of knowledge. And that hierarchy of knowledge becomes more important than the human being and the mind-potential of the human being: the ossified position that knowledge is more important than humanitarianism is still preserved. We are still working on a mechanical model instead of a human model. How do you get schools more interested in a human model? This is what is important.

Leonore Bravo: True, but the community has to understand this, because the community is controlling the schools.

J. Wagner: We've been trying to do some of that. We have an "In The Streets" program in a poverty community; we have an "In The Streets" program in an affluent community too. I was wondering how you got people from the affluent community to understand the enormous tragedy and the enormous waste of human life. They can understand that poor people need help, but they regard them as social problems, not as people in need of human kindness. I'm interested in how you get rich to understand the vast waste and tragedy of the lives of the poor.

V. Rascon: How about the people who are poor -- white or Spanish-speaking -- starting to show the white middle class? It is the middle class people who are doing all the planning of programs for the poor communities, when really the entire community should be involved. And that includes the Spanish-speaking community, which is not being heard from, simply because they are not involved in planning any of the activities at the school site within the community.

Jerry Brown: You keep talking about changing the attitudes of the middle class and those who hold the purse strings, but our feeling is that you cannot build an organization on grants and donations and contributions, because money of that kind has a habit of disappearing. When we started out organizing, the farm workers were paying us dues. A lot of people said, "Oh, you can't take money from the poor farm workers." But you have to be independent. For instance, we applied for an OEO grant for leadership training; then we went out on strike, and we didn't take the grant. In the Valley, our local congressmen were off to Washington: "The leadership of this organization is irresponsible; we know these people; this grant can't be applied."

In the Valley -- and this is a particular situation but I think it's also true in the ghettos -- the economic situation has meant that minority groups and poor people have tended to be concentrated in specific area, so that in terms of numbers, there are enough people to take local political control. We can get that control in the Valley. It's going to take a while; it is going to take time to organize it. And one of the difficulties in getting control is that unless people can get through school and learn English it is very hard for them to learn how to vote. If the officials of the system don't explain to people how to become citizens, and do not explain what the rights are and how people can get them, then people cannot take advantage of their voting power.

But we have that power potentially, and that is why the growers are so afraid of us. They are not afraid of economic change; they can absorb the extra wages. They are afraid of the political power which is going to pass to the poor people and minority group people in the Valley, once they organize themselves. If we waited for the attitudes of the people from the hills of Oakland to change, it would take too long.

C. Leyba: You referred earlier to the issues concerning separatism, and I would like to raise a further question about this. Many black people feel that the only way in which the black community can achieve dignity is by developing its own school systems and political structures, for an indefinite period of time. You implied that the only hope for the Spanish-American in California is to be given the opportunity to develop outside the establishment. My question is how long will it be before black Americans and Spanish-Americans have achieved enough cultural identity to want to amalgamate with American society as a whole?

Jerry Brown: As I said, I thought that racism was a two-edged thing. I think that white, Anglo, middle class people should organize in the Anglo communities and deal with the problems that are there. There is an element of separatism in the farm workers movement, because there are a lot of Mexican-Americans; but some of our locals are half black. We have to organize farm workers, but you face the problem of what the system has done to individuals in any group you deal with. The contradiction comes at this point: the establishment wants to give money and wants to help, but the establishment is influenced by votes and the local politicians have to have a say, or there has to be a "responsible representative" from the business community. So at that point, when action that's really going to change lives is taken, such as the attempts to prevent stores in the ghetto from selling over-priced bad food, or to go on strike, then those funds disappear. You can't rely on the funds and the people who are tied to these programs, even though many of these people are basically good and are genuinely trying to help; they are tied to that fifteen thousand dollars a year that they are getting in the OEO program, and so there comes a point at which they can't help us because they can't make the decision to be cut off from the dollar and just throw in with the organization that poor people are building. (In Delano we are just clapping our hands in anticipation of Nixon's cutting off all those OEO grants so we can get some of these good organizers to come and work for us for five dollars a week; they would really enjoy themselves a lot more.)

The attitudes of community people are often criticised and yet middle class people, in an attempt to be concerned, show up at seven o'clock at night and say, "Take me to see some farm worker families." This is an insult, and is in a way typical of the whole problem. These are good people that want to help, and they bring you food and clothing.

"Take me to see some farm worker families." They would never think of going to a grower's house or to the school board unannounced and saying, "Take me to see your family." It's this basic unawareness which is the problem, this curious respect only for a man's status. The racism and the cultural assumptions are deeply ingrained and none of us have escaped them. I haven't escaped; no person can grow up in America and escape those assumptions. They permeate us all.

Leonore Bravo: Well, what I am saying is that you have to educate the people who are not coming down to Delano with food or clothing.

Another thing that occurs to me is that there is an inherent assumption that if equal opportunity had been present, we wouldn't have these problems now. Even as far back as 1932, the Mexican-Americans had problems, and surely they should have started organizing themselves then.

Jerry Brown: A teacher from Delano was also telling me about how Mexicans had never organized. (I'm not a Mexican-American. I'm a representative with the United Farm Workers Organized Committee, the grape strike). She was saying, "The Mexicans are docile; they have a fatalistic culture; the women are suppressed; and why haven't they ever organized?"

I don't know how many books there are on the Mexican-American culture that just repeat this. We have perpetuated racism with theories based either on theological difference, or on biological differences -- the color of your skin, how many curves in your brain, and the size of your head; and today, the sociologists are perpetuating the culture of racism by writing about "culture of poverty" and about "Mexican-American fatalism." They have taken over the doctrine and are becoming the apologists of it. The sociologists who have written about the Mexican-American and who have said, "Why hasn't he ever organized?" should take the trouble to read C. M. Williams, Factories in the Field, or The History of Labor Unions in the American Agriculture by Stewart Jamison.

There has been a history of brutal, bloody and dramatic strikes, from the time that the Chinese, who built the railroads to carry the fruit from California to the East Coast markets, were put to work in the fields. There has been systematic corruption in the law courts and of legal procedures in order to bring in foreign workers and to maintain a completely elastic labor force that is a labor subsidy: these are the reasons for the strikes being broken. The Grapes of Wrath is not very far away.

I was talking to one little girl whose father is in the strike. They read The Grapes of Wrath in school. (That's big progress for Kern County because when The Grapes of Wrath first came out, it was banned there.) The teacher's analysis was, "The novel is a gross exaggeration -- the police are not that bad." The girl said, "Well, the police on our picket lines seem pretty much the same." So how can students respect their schools? At the graduate level the professors are writing these treatises about how the Mexican-American is docile, and in the schools there is same process of presenting an image of the world that the kids know is not true.

Leonore Bravo: I could not agree with you more heartily. To get right back to the thing you said first, let's get labor better organized and let's handle the problems of the farm workers and then we won't have any problem.

J. Kleinert: This relates to what is happening in the schools. For the minority groups to achieve dignity, they are going to have to be not only accepted, but they are going to have to be allowed to take the responsibility for their own teaching and their own school system.

Jerry Brown: It may seem very irrational to people who would like to see the economic and educational process go on in an orderly manner, but when the minority groups do take on this responsibility which will mean radical cultural separation, perhaps then a better relationship than the hypersensitive one which at present exists between groups will emerge, as soon as the suppressed groups feel confident and equal.

At the moment, we seem to be more aware of the poor when they are black or brown, but we all know that the white people make the largest group of poor in the United States in terms of numbers. The white people who are poor are also a subculture. The sociologists have interested themselves in the black and the non-white communities in the way that the anthropologists study Africa; it has become prestigious to do so. But I think that this is merely an inverted form of white racism. The poor white people, on the other hand, have been ignored. They do, however, have one very good organizer who goes to their stock car races, who goes to the hillbilly roundups, who goes to the rodeo. His name is George Wallace. I think that the professional Anglo people in this country should start working with those white people whom they can't communicate with. If they don't, then all of our civil liberties are in danger of being destroyed.

Lorenzo Ulibarri: The problem in New Mexico and the Southwest, as I see it, is different. We deal more with the sedentary Mexican-American, not the migrant. In the western part of New Mexico, the

Mexican-American has more opportunity to succeed in a white man's world. In the eastern part, near the Texas state line, the Mexican-American tends to be more disadvantaged. He can be a lot more easily duped into voting the way somebody wants him to vote. Many administrators in our area feel that we need more Spanish-surname teachers, because it seems that the kids identify themselves with these teachers.

The political structure of New Mexico is rather interesting. For the first time in the history of New Mexico, we had a Mexican-American candidate running for governor. His name was Fabian Chavez. He was running against probably one of the worst governors that New Mexico has had, and he still lost. I think it was a difference of about two or three thousand votes. It seems that the Mexican-American in the eastern part and in the northern part of the country, as well as the Anglo, have failed to communicate and interact with each other; as a result, the Mexican-American has lost a lot of his political power. He does not have enough education to help him think critically about the political candidates and to decide for whom he should vote and for whom he should not vote. The results have, of course, been extremely detrimental to the people there.

V. Rascon: We talk about communication and community relations, but we have forgotten one of our greatest failures in communication -- the relationship between the teacher and the child, and the problems of Mexican-American children in school. We are so subject-oriented in the schools that we forget our primary function -- we forget to be human.

As a child in San Francisco I was always in trouble, and was always being discriminated against because of my dark skin. I was even ashamed of my Mexican culture and of the fact that my mother spoke Spanish, and it is true that I would have been a complete failure in school, had not one teacher taken an interest in me and involved me in activities. We talk about kids dropping out, but I think a lot of teachers have dropped out, both black and white.

Last year I was in Austin, Texas, for the National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans, and was confronted by all kinds of discrimination in shops and cafes. It was this experience which really triggered me into becoming active in Oakland.

J. Kleinert: Dr. Smith was saying these same things in his speech, and all this relates closely to what our work was to be in this meeting. The question we were to speak to is, "What do the home, the street, and the culture teach the Spanish-surname child as to what he is and what his world is about?" The things which were described by Dr. Smith in relation to the Negro ghetto youngster are things upon which we should make some sort of generalizations if we can, and relate them particularly to the Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surname child. Most of our discussion thus far has centered around the things that the youngster learns in the community about the establishment and about the ways in which he must avoid the unwritten rules that seem to constrain him as opposed to other youngsters.

But I wonder if any of these things can be applied to the setting of the American schools, particularly the setting of 1969, or if these are all things which will require drastic revisions in the way we organize and operate our schools. Have we failed almost completely, or are there experiments and examples that some of you are familiar with which you feel have been successful, not with an isolated case or two but for the average minority group youngster who is in that setting? Does this only happen where the minority group youngsters are concentrated and the whole school is made up of youngsters from the same ethnic group?

Jerry Brown: I would like to focus on the fact that schools are so subject-oriented, and are over-concerned with measuring results. We face this problem, as organizers, with either an OEO project or the school system. For instance, we could not begin to think of accepting OEO grants for our organizing, because sooner or later some project administrator wants indices of what you have accomplished. It is impossible to measure our progress, because it takes a long time to see the results of our organizing. The schools are facing the same problem. Pumping students full of information should not have to be the primary goal. If the school is not going to be condemned as completely worthless and irrelevant, then apart from some basic skills, it should be concerned to promote the idea of personal worth and personal self-image, particularly when the school is serving a poor community. And this is surely more important than geography lessons.

J. Kleinert: But how then do we reconcile the contradiction in what you have just said, and what Dr. Smith said? On the one hand we, as teachers, must forget the cognitive aspects of learning and concentrate on the idea of personal worth and feelings, starting with the young children; on the other hand we must not use cultural deprivation and large classes as an excuse not to teach. To use your own words, "You are here to teach, so teach us." It seems to me that that second statement is calling for the cognitive approach -- we had better show an improvement in reading and conceptual skills among the children in those first few years.

This is the great dilemma of those teachers who are dedicated and hard working in the ghetto schools; they want desperately to do the things that the mistreated group itself says is necessary, but they hear both of these things, and both seem equally legitimate. I'd be interested in your reaction to that.

Jerry Brown: I may not have any answer for that. It probably depends on the teacher. I have seen kids who are failing math but who can understand and can do complicated calculations concerning piece-rates. And the ranch committee (a committee always elected from among workers on the ranch to do the bargaining because they're the only people who really understand enough about that piece-rate) consists of people who have not even been through second grade. These are the people who can sit down and work on a contract. Surely this is relevant to what is happening in school.

J. Wagner: I think it is untrue to say that the cognitive and the affective methods present a dilemma for teachers. There should not have to be a contradiction between a teacher being able to present content in history or in math, and being able to communicate to the children that she cares and respects their own personal worth. Who in the world separates the cognitive and the affective domains anyway? We are human beings, we are alive, we are whole and we create knowledge. You do not give a person a sense of worth by patting him on the back and saying, "You're a nice person." You give him a sense of worth by allowing him to realize that his mind is at work and his mind is creating. What happens in the schools is that the learning process becomes so abstract that creativity and the relationship between the self-concept and the cognitive domain is lost. Self-respect cannot be acquired in a vacuum. You begin to learn about yourself by understanding what happens to your own mind at work, whether you are involved in making a piece of sculpture or a math problem, and by understanding how your mind creates knowledge.

B. Gaarder: If we are going to accept Bruner's ideas concerning the cognitive and affective aspects of a child's learning, then with regard to Spanish-speaking students, we could say that Bruner's two "wild man" days would be two days in which Spanish would be the exclusive medium of instruction in the schools. This could be Bruner's "radicalism." For the Mexican-American and certainly for the Indian child, this would be an extraordinary gesture in recognizing the legitimacy of his way of being a human being. This kind of recognition is particularly important in the case of the little Indian child, because he's the one who is really destroyed by this system. For the first time there is the possibility of doing this. The teachers for these programs would have to be native Spanish speakers, or speakers of the particular Indian language, of course.

Leonore Bravo: I'm very interested in what you say. I would like to ask you, why is this necessary in the case of immigrants speaking Spanish but not necessary in the case of immigrants who come speaking Russian, Italian, Greek, etc.?

B. Gaarder: You asked the right question of the right person. The most significant difference, and there are many, is that Mexican-Americans are a visible minority, in other words visible to the eye.

Leonore Bravo: And this keeps them from learning another language?

B. Gaarder: A visible minority in this country has always been, and still is, made the object of very special prejudicial treatment. That is to say they cannot conform, because to conform means to be like all the rest: they cannot be like all the rest because they don't look like them.

Leonore Bravo: What about the Chinese though? And the Japanese?

B. Gaarder: The Chinese chiefly work out their problems by financing extra classes, so that language and culture can be transmitted outside the school system.

Leonore Bravo: So we should really teach the languages of all minority groups. Everybody should have two languages in school.

L. Castillo: Right. I think everybody should do this. But you see, what happens is that people who come to this country with a tradition of transmitting culture through education are able to do this much more easily than, say, my parents, who come from peasant people in Mexico with no educational background at all. The idea of transmitting the culture through education is not really a part of their background.

In New York, Spaniards have Spanish-language schools, just as the Jewish people have Hebrew schools. But in California I don't know of one Spanish language school. The main reason for this lack is that we are all too poor. Now that we have an emerging middle class, we should start thinking about having extra-curricular education for our children.

Leonore Bravo: Could this be done in the school?

V. Rascon: No, because this is a pluralistic society in the first place and most immigrants who come from other countries have become totally acculturated. Also we feel that we would be tying ourselves to a sinking ship. And why should we give up some of the positive things of our Mexican culture to become totally acculturated Americans?

B. Gaarder: The only way to be accepted is to conform. But if it is either impossible or undesirable to conform, then the only way to be accepted is just to have enough strength to demand your fair share of things. And in the case of the Mexican-American, and of the American Indian too, he cannot conform because he is a visible minority, and in this country there is a strong prejudice against any visible minority. He may not think it is a good idea to conform. He may not want to conform because his view of the world may often be entirely different from that of the majority culture. He was here first and historically that makes an awful lot of difference. His is a completely different philosophy from that of immigrants, such as the Russians, etc.

It has been a sadistic public education policy in this country all along to force the child to make the choice of becoming all-American or alienating himself from his own culture. The results of this are tragic, and they are the root of much of the delinquency that we see today.

Jerry Brown: I am beginning to think that what we are working for can only be accomplished outside the institutional context. It stems from the institutional context but the route that we are taking is via unionization and community power to political power and from there to changing welfare and schools and to being able to bring pressures as an organized community to make sure that children of two years are not put into the lower end of the track, unable to get out again. And that is a very long and complicated process. It requires long-term political organization.

I was very interested in exploring the politically feasible ways in which we could begin to experiment maybe with storefront schools. However, I am really not qualified to talk about what kinds of departures could be made that would be acceptable to the existing schools and administrators, who have to be taken into consideration. We always have to think in terms of what is feasible.

V. Rascón: Mr. Boyd spoke about educational programs within the plant and the four different kinds of programs in vocational training, and the way in which the counselors were working with the hard-core unemployable young adults -- he was talking about young people in Detroit, and Newark, etc., primarily the blacks. But it is tragic that we have had to wait until now for industry to run educational programs within their own plants. If industry can do this at the adult level within a plant, teaching young black people or Mexican-Americans to learn to read signs so they can take a bus in the morning, etc., why can't the schools adopt the same kinds of programs at junior high and high school levels and begin a new kind of innovative curricula which would be more meaningful to the youngsters?

If these programs were started soon enough, by the time students graduated from high school, they would have some kind of a certificate to get into that plant; and they need not be hired as hard-core unemployed. Perhaps, too, a student could work part-time in the plant and see his way through school if he wants to get a higher education. This could give an opportunity for self-help.

When young people of nineteen or twenty or twenty-one have to start learning how to read or how to take a bus, it means that human resources are being wasted. What happened between the ages ten and twenty? What happened in the schools if no one was helping the hard-core unemployed? If industry can do this and business can do it, how about bringing industry and business personnel, with their equipment, into the junior high and high schools instead of, say, organizing yet more programs for teachers.

It seems to me, that since the schools do not seem to be able to do their job, it would be a good idea to allow industry to do it.

C. Leyba: I disagree very strongly with this idea. If private industry were to control the education of minority children, the effects would be detrimental, because business is concerned with self-interest, and this means keeping the minority in a submissive, conforming position. Industry will teach the various skills efficiently, but it will not be able to educate in the true sense. It will not educate the ability to form valued judgments; it will not educate for leadership.

In our desperate attempt to make education successful where it is at present failing, we seize on a number of alternative "solutions," without properly examining what we mean by education. For example: take the limited perceptions of the kids, attach some kind of subject matter to these and use this as a kind of vehicle to lead them into the broad pathways of the kinds of learning that everybody receives if they come from middle class homes. That is one such solution. Another solution in an attempt to make the learning relevant, is to attach work experience to learning: release the kids for work during the day and then keep them in school a little bit longer. Another technique is to have compensatory and remedial systems.

All of these, however, are assuming the one unassumable thing, namely that education as it exists now needs some way of bringing people into it. But if you listen carefully to the blacks, for instance, they are saying that education as it exists now is in fact not education; that if education is reformed in terms of the insights of black people, it will mean developing an educational system which is good not only for blacks, but for everybody. What we have now is superb training, and the middle class person can absorb it and the lower class person cannot. And under the label of compensatory education, under the label of remedial education, we are trying to bring people willy-nilly into the thing that we call education, which is in fact not education at all. And so when Boyd says that he's doing something good, he is. God bless Boyd! But he is not educating.

L. Castillo: One of the things that bothered me was what Dr. Shaftel was saying. She was talking about her experiences with middle class youngsters and about how they didn't recognize their own dishonesty and their escape mechanisms during role-play activities. And then she said that no cognitive material was going to help with these problems. I don't believe that; I agree rather with what Dr. Bruner was saying: that there are no arts, there is no literature, without cognitive development and discipline, and that this discipline is power.

Charles Leyba: I agree. Name one type of conscious event that is noncognitive and teachable. Why even talk about the cognitive versus the affective? If we talk about affective things, they become cognitive when we talk about them. Why does a man of the stature of Jerome Bruner even have to think of a dichotomy between cognitive and affective? He must do so because our educational system operates on the assumption of a dichotomy. The demands of industry and the requirements of the universities are responsible for the emphasis on the cognitive aspects of learning, which do not make for leadership and citizenship. If education were about self-knowledge, self-appreciation, a finding of oneself within the universe, the political system and the human scene, hand and heart would never be divided.

J. Kleinert: But surely the dichotomy does not exist in the elementary school, which is not affected by industry or university departments?

Charles Leyba: The elementary schools develop skills in preparation for more advanced skills at the high school, in preparation for yet more advanced skills, which means that we are all majoring in skills. And since the middle class home develops skills in its students that prepare them, from the beginning, for the schools, they have a head start on everybody and they race off. And that is not education. Some skills are necessary, but to continue to emphasize skills more than anything else is to de-emphasize heart.

The Job Corps is yet another example of a program which has been useful only in training people to get a job and earn money and fall in love with the better things (hopefully their kids will become leaders); but it did not equip them to become anything more than money-makers and begetters.

For some reason, the Mexican-American kid does not go to college. At California State College at Los Angeles, if a Mexican-American stumbled off his front porch or rolled out of bed, he'd land on our campus; that's how close they are. And Pancho Villa never surrounded a town more thoroughly than Mexican-Americans surround California State at Los Angeles. Sheer population pressure should get them on the campus. It cannot be entirely a matter of money either. Many more poor black and poor white students go to college than do Mexicans. But they are simply not there. Now you tell me why.

Leonore Bravo: One of the reasons for this is cultural. The aggressive qualities needed for members of a minority group to go to college are not part of the Mexican culture. The second reason is that Mexicans migrated to North America because of economic insecurity in the first place, and they are still not economically secure, so that they tend to cling to a mother-dominated home for security. Then the language pattern is reinforced, and no attempt to acculturize themselves is made.

V. Rascon: And you really need to be a little aggressive to go over to the counselor's office and demand a scholarship. It takes a tremendous amount of courage, which in turn takes self-respect and pride.

M. Da'vila: One advantage that black people have over the Mexican-Americans is that more of them have a better command of English, and are more easily able to communicate.

L. Castillo: I really think that the biggest problem for Mexicans as a visible minority is the problem of a positive self-image. Jerry has been saying all this time that one of the greatest things that has happened to Mexicans in California is the Farm Workers Union. I haven't been a farm worker since I was fifteen years old. But that union has done more for the self-image of the Mexican-American than anything else. We are not the little people who never get anything any more, because we have a leader, Cesar Chavez, who is short and dark and beautiful and articulate.

B. Further Comment on the Spanish Discussion

Leonore Bravo
Oakland, California

To the Tri-University Project:

It has taken me a little time to become oriented to the Tri-University Project as I was completely unfamiliar with it, although I find that at least two Oakland classroom teachers are participants -- one of them last year, and one this year.

I find myself disagreeing with practically all of the assumptions inferred in the "Introduction to the Conference".[1] First, take the target of the project which seems to be the improvement of the quality of the teacher. With further implication that men need to be in the classroom to represent the power of intellect and the advantages of education.

I come from a state where more time and money is spent on teacher preparation than in some others with the result that we have, especially in the urban centers near to cultural advantages which are appreciated by bright young people, many talented and able young teachers. Among them are many of high imagination, courage and flamboyance. Just such people are frequently placed in poverty area classrooms for the reason that we have so many of them and for the reason that it takes courage and imagination to respond creatively and hence to survive the conditions with which they are faced. Very often they become exhausted by the efforts which they put forth against the noise level and highly individualistic, non-listening behavior of the children in those classrooms. On one occasion in reply to the question what can I do that will help these children, I answered, get all of the parents in and impress upon them the need to train their children to listen and to take turns speaking.

Secondly, I see no validity to the assumption that men are needed in the classroom to represent the power of intellect and the advantages of an education to boys. If I were of Arthur Pearl's persuasion I'd reply "crap". Boys are very able to see that education has gotten men into such status professions as law, medicine and education. At best men in the classroom either cast a reflection on those men as being "unable to do and so they teach" as the old cliché went, or else it might suggest that teaching is an acceptable thing for men to be doing; or if they were more sophisticated they might know what many of those men state, "I'm only doing this so that I can get into administration". One doesn't hear this from women because women know that they aren't going to get such positions. Hence, women are the better elementary teachers because they feel that teaching is worthy of their life's efforts.

---

[1] Mrs. Bravo is quoting from the "Introduction to Conference" placed in the conference program.

Perhaps if more trainers of teachers, i. e. professors of education, were from the ranks of the above mentioned dedicated women there would be a greater dedication to the education of teachers and to the quality of the product turned out.

Next, I can't imagine any individual at the policy stating level who has had the benefit of observing the school at first hand, assuming that school can change society -- and that the elementary school teacher can do so. Elementary school teachers who seek to change the social framework within which the school operates are more likely to find themselves with unfavorable references and recommendations and hence to be on the way to a series of potentially less rewarding classroom situations than to be given credit for progressive social thought. Inherent in this is an argument against those aforementioned men in the elementary classroom -- they are the least likely people to advocate change, anxious as they are to be rewarded by the establishment with an administrative position.

Next I take issue with the negative inference assigned to cautious, prudent and middle class and especially to assigning two valuable personality characteristics to the middle class and worse yet equating all of this with being provincial and insulated. I can think of no more provincial and insulated people than the lower-class Mexican population with whom I have contact. Their provincialism and their insulation in terms of only attending the Spanish language theatre, of confining their shopping to the Mexican ghetto, of confining themselves to their own language and hence to their own subculture is noteworthy in San Francisco and in Oakland and in every other U. S. city where they congregate. They are comfortable in this way and see no need to put forth the effort to come out of their insulation. While the basis of this insulation may have been insecurity in a new culture, there is little excuse for its continuation year after year of residence in the U. S.

The above brings me to a related criticism of the Spanish bilingual program in the schools. Obviously if we arrange so that children of such environment can be sheltered from a need to learn English, we only add to the tendency of the less able members of the Spanish speaking population to further insulate themselves.

It would be far more adaptive socially to spend money used for the bilingual instruction program on efforts to get the parents of that part of the population to speak English and to prepare themselves to take part in the social and political life of the whole community. No matter what the school does to upgrade teachers or education it will be of little effect if the girls in Mexican families are kept home to fulfill their traditional role as mother substitutes for the younger children and as mothers' helpers. As long as the parents valuation of education permits this, the children can hardly value education nor be expected to conform to the necessary demands of attendance and participation which represent a giving up of some of ones individuality in order to secure an ultimate good. So more sincere efforts to get the children to school are needed and these efforts are needed far down in the grades. There are many statements as to the non-conforming behavior of the part of the Spanish background population with which we are concerned.

There is nothing inherently evil nor unprogressive nor reactionary about being cautious and prudent. Some of the most successful gamblers, nearly all researchers whose contributions to knowledge hold up, mountain climbers who come back alive and social activists who have managed to have some impact on the quality of our life have been cautious and prudent and God deliver me from an M. D. who is not!

What is needed is to reach those in our society who have the power to allow the school to change, to allow for the creative, challenging, thought provoking teacher to operate precisely with the middle class youth upon whom their message can have impact -- rather than relegating them to ghetto situations where they break their spirit and lose the flashing eye very quickly against the divergent noise of a non-conforming unmotivated population.

As long as this society finds it to its advantage to suppress the genuine participation of elementary school teachers, so long as those teachers are under the control of the manipulative forces in our society they will respond with abstention and indifference as far as change is concerned.

As pointed out by Richard Poirier in Atlantic, the dominant forms of thinking, not just in our country but in the world in general have resulted in poverty, in the quality of life in our cities, the war and the various related social problems which we face.

It seems to me that an approach to what's wrong with our dominant forms of thinking is more basic to change and to advance than how to upgrade the quality of teaching.

Dear Miss Bravo:

Since I wrote the introduction to the conference, I'll have to defend it. I have worked with boys in the ghetto; I have seen men work there. I have seen liberal spirited and fairly daring people work there with support from federal programs and an alert and flexible administrative group. As Othello remarks, "they have done the state some service in such positions." Art Pearl's students have. Others have. I believe that what you are saying is (1) that, given present administrations and administrative practices, no one can make it where education is difficult and (2) that present educational administrations reflect a society which needs some sort of conversion. I couldn't agree more (cf. Haubrich's article in Reason and Change). But someone has to change in a conversion. Today the most powerful single administrative "corporate" structure we have are school structures. They not only are made by "society"; they make it. And school and societal structures are today being powerfully influenced by "students" who are tomorrow's teachers. If they can change the political direction of a nation -- as they did vis a vis Vietnam -- they may be able to change our schools (though, as one of the Chrysler executives remarked to me, they are the most conservative institutions in our society). I do not look to those who will be ground down. And I do expect that they will go both to suburbia and the ghetto. I may be wrong. We are trying to approach the question of what's wrong with our forms of thinking; we must find means to teach us what might be other and more humane forms. I would hope that our teachers might teach us -- really teach us. We have the power, but we may not have the courage; and as Jules Henry said at New Orleans, "courage is more important than brains." I would like to publish your remarks in our report.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Olson

155 - 158

III. Teachers and Education in a Conservative Region: Appalachia

The New Orleans Appalachia Committee

The Appalachia committee included community representatives; school people, and people from Higher Education -- both people who teach and people who administer in Higher Education. The Minneapolis conference of the Tri-University project described what Appalachia community representatives saw as the difficulties in the education of teachers in the area (A Pride of Lions). The group also spoke to Mr. Davies and other concerned OE officials concerning its conception of the problem. The New Orleans Appalachia group was encouraged to look to the alleviation of these problems; it was encouraged to consider:

1. The potential role of industry in Educational development in Appalachia.

2. The role of cultural change at the grass roots.

3. The role of a more sensitive appreciation of what learning and instruction can do.

4. The role of the shifting of the relationship between the economic system and the system provided to encourage learning in Early Childhood.

A transcript of the discussion among members of the New Orleans Appalachia committee follows.

Appalachia Group Discussion

A. M. Johnston: I am very much concerned that maybe revolution has passed Appalachia by. I see riots in other places but in no cities in Appalachia. I see student revolts and strikes, except in Appalachian institutions. I see the various minority groups not enraged enough to do anything. I'm concerned that at my own institution, for instance, the students are so docile that they will be pushed around by a state and administration and not do anything. I see the same thing happening at the University of Virginia, some of the West Virginia institutions and some of the Kentucky institutions; I'm concerned that there are no riots, there are no revolutions, not among the poor, not among the Negroes, not among the youth. I want to know what we can do to get the people of Appalachia or groups within Appalachia so worked up, so disturbed, that they will demand change.

We are a long way from thinking about what we can do about teacher education (this, after all, is a continual job for us) as long as there remains the fundamental job of causing the people--whether they are the youth, the poor, the Negroes--to demand better schools and better curricula. My feeling is that the school reflects the community.

F. Stallings: I think there is a distinction about Appalachia that can be easily overlooked. Whereas in Knoxville and in Louisville proper we might be having a confrontation between the large group of "haves" and the large group of "have nots," the blacks versus the whites, what you have in Appalachia is a very small, very strong power structure in opposition to the rest of the community. This is a form of paternalism which is harder to combat; it is a little like the plantation economy further south. It goes back to the old coal mining system where the company owned the school, the churches, all the houses--it really controlled everything.

It has moved away from this a little: we no longer have the commissary; miners are no longer paid in scrip; in fact the mining industry is fading in some parts of Appalachia. But the spirit still exists. A very few people in the top power structure operate the entire community in a paternalistic fashion.

I visited one of these communities in Kentucky a few years ago where the school superintendent was under fire. I was there supposedly as an arbitrator. I talked to a number of people there--the "haves" and the "have nots"--and all they could talk about was the handful of people who controlled everything. It happened that the school superintendent was at the center because he was the largest employer in the entire county. He was the major political manipulator for the entire county. He and his family were at the head of the social structure of the entire county, and everybody else had to fall in place somewhere below this. He and half a dozen henchmen whom he handpicked had complete control, as far as I could see, of that entire county.

Now this is a situation, which is going to take different treatment from the situation in which large groups are involved. You're talking about, so often, a handful of people at the top of the power structure who control everything, so it's not just a matter of getting people at the bottom of the power structure concerned; it's a matter of getting practically the entire community stirred up.

A. M. Johnston: I don't think that these people at the top of the power structure are going to be concerned until there is some form of revolution or riot among the oppressed groups.

F. Stallings: If we are here for the purpose of advocating riots, then I phase out. You have to be a little more careful of your language. I remember attending a civil rights meeting in the University of Oklahoma a few years ago, and people were confusing the "militancy" with "violence."

What we are concerned with is stirring these people up, getting them activated to get something done. Now this is going to spill over sometimes into extreme radicalism. We can't help that, but we certainly are not here to advocate it; at least I'm not. In any case, this is sometimes an overaction and if we are here for anything, it is to try to get people to use the processes, to sense their political strength, and to move, and to demand.

Sophia Nelson: I agree that people in Appalachia tend to be docile and that we need more aggressive leaders representative of the people. Schools have a lot to do with developing this and at the moment they are failing. I have seen signs from my state board of education and other places that where students are a bit critical they are slapped down very hard, very fast, and very few staff people work with students either to guide or to reinforce them.

We as teachers are failing in this respect. I don't think West Virginia will blow up in riots. West Virginia certainly doesn't tend this way. We pride ourselves on not having any trouble (although rumors swept that there was going to be trouble a couple of times).

I am, though, depressed about what has happened in the one Appalachian school that I know about, Bluefield State College; a bomb was placed in a school building, and immediately it was assumed that all the black students were responsible for it. So the president closed the dormitories which were almost the only possible residence in the city of Bluefield for the black students.

This is the way we react. He was backed by the board. The former president, a black graduate of Bluefield State had been replaced by what many people, including the state's commission on human rights, considered a subterfuge in order to make room for a white president, who is now in office. In Bluefield, West Virginia, which borders Bluefield, Virginia, whites were coming in in such numbers that it was felt that the time had come for the leadership to be white.

My school, is the other West Virginia school which is also a Negro institution. We have a president and people are always asking, "Is he white or not?" Officially he's Negro. He's going to have to retire in about four years, and I would like to see in the region the kind of enlightenment that would help our board to recognize it is not necessary to put a white man in. I've got nothing against my good white colleagues who have possibilities, but we should not assume, if whites move into the student body on a large scale, or if whites move into faculty on a large scale as they have done in both of these West Virginia schools, that immediately the leadership must be white.

I have been proud of the fact that West Virginia was more enlightened than the rest of the country in this respect, that the students around Charleston, around Institute, West Virginia, moved in quickly, and did not wait so long as people down Bluefield way. They recognized an asset and they didn't wait for the faculty to change its complexion. The faculty is changing it's complexion very rapidly, but the faculty is not objecting to those members of the Negro leadership which survive.

The schools in the state are not all equally dead, nor equally conservative, and one can learn from some of the people and some of the institutions where there is intellectual life. I remember Dr. Leslie Martin who is our Board of Education's Secretary and Director of Higher Education. Things were about to blow at Bluefield, and he came over and had a meeting with a key committee at our school to ask why we thought things had not gone the same way at West Virginia State as at Bluefield.

But West Virginia is representative; it's the only state that's all Appalachian in the region. We lose people, and we lose the aggressive people: the people are docile in Appalachia because those who are ambitious are getting out. They are not bothering to stay.

And so I would like to see us work at holding some of our aggressive people, holding some of our critical people, holding some of the people who do not just accept everything. This is something we can do, beginning in the classroom. If you have a student who speaks up, or if some one speaks for experimentation in education, listen to him, instead of assuming that because we never had any problems in Appalachia, everything is fine.

We constantly allow our best material to escape from Appalachia. When they come in from out of state, we grumble about training people from out of state, even though they contribute a great deal of leavening that we need. Then when they're about to be graduated, whether they came from out of state or from the state, we lose the best ones every time because we have not sold them on what they can do. It would seem to me that since we're in positions of some leadership in our state, we should persuade these bright, critical, aggressive young people, while they're with us, that there's a chance for them to work into positions of influence. This is the only way we can expect to regain any leadership in our area.

H. V. Scott: My first experience of Appalachian conditions came when I worked as a graduate assistant in remedial reading and visited several Appalachian states, the ones that were granted the Title I provisions for equipment, etc. I remember very clearly that there was an amazing analogy between the way the poor white students were treated in the classrooms and the way the black child is treated in the urban situation.

These people are docile because they more or less sense that they are powerless and what we have to do is work for a change of heart in the power structure.

F. Stallings: I agree that there is an analogy between the way the black student is treated in his school and the way these people are treated. There are several reasons for this. One is the inadequacy of the preparation of the teacher. In Kentucky you will find more emergency teachers and more teachers with less training in the rural areas than you will in the urban areas.

Also, in our institutions, it is true that we are not training teachers to understand these people; we are not infusing into our teachers very much aggressiveness. They are docile people themselves, so they go out and cooperate with the power structure in these communities. They fit in nicely. They don't want to stir the waters themselves. They will take many kinds of abuses themselves from the people in control.

58

I worked in Appalachia a few years ago with a group of teachers and principals in a summertime workshop. There were about three hundred teachers from the entire county. The program followed a traditional format: every morning we would meet together in the school gymnasium and the superintendent would open the meeting; every morning there would be a reading from the Bible, the salute to the flag, and a devotional. Then the superintendent invariably made announcements to his principals and teachers about ordering coal for the winter, collecting their attendance registers, requisitioning the textbooks: this took up the entire morning, and was repeated every day throughout the conference, which lasted over a week. I could not help noting, though, that every request made of those teachers carried with it a threat: for example, "If you do not do this, you will not be paid." "If you do not do this, when your time comes up for tenure this will be held against you."

And so like the Hebraic poetry which balances thought with counterthought, every statement that the superintendent made was a demand plus a threat. And he behaved in this manner because it was the only pattern he recognized. This was what he was hearing from the power structure in town, "Mr. Superintendent, if you don't do this and don't do it this way, we will hold it against you."

This is a tradition that goes way back. One of our jobs in teacher education is to condition teachers to look with more dignity upon their roles and to adopt not only loyalty to the superintendent, loyalty to the principal, loyalty to the board of education, but also loyalty to some ethics. We must encourage them to feel respect for human beings, and to protect the right of free speech and free assembly.

H. V. Scott: One of the difficulties of operating from within an institution is that if we deal with a major problem, we might find ourselves being destroyed by the structure which exists around us.

Let me give you an example. At our college, we may be getting involved in a VISTA education workers' preparation program. That sounds innocent but when you consider the reputation of VISTA in Appalachia, then you realize the risk I am taking. VISTA workers have been thrown out of two of the counties in the state for showing people, for example, how they can demand their rights and insure that their kids go on the school bus, etc; this, of course, is not well received. All of the workers associated with VISTA have been maligned almost beyond repair in the communities and counties in which they live.

Here is another point that I would like to mention. A couple of weeks ago we had an assembly, in which a psychiatrist and a prominent minister from the town talked about the sex attitudes of the young. The psychiatrist, of course, is a highly open kind of a person and his attitude was quite radical. This was one of our better attended programs and he shocked the people from the community who came. Later, I read a letter in our Charleston newspaper criticizing us for "allowing this godless person to preach such things."

Well, our college has essentially been a forum for liberal thought in our valley. But we have suffered for that particular forum, and the question remains of how far we can be a forum for evolution without being destroyed in the process. The dean himself, for instance, is a highly vulnerable person in the political structure.

We have also been trying to build into the requirements of our program for teachers such books as Black Rage and the Autobiography of Malcom X. And I am aware that more and more of the students on our campus are, in fact, catching up on some of this literature, including other important books which often have a black emphasis to them, like Thirty-six Children and Death at an Early Age. This is not easy to do and you have to decide how far you can go. If you were not from Appalachia, you would not believe the kinds of troubles we run into.

Many of our students are, of course, leaving Appalachia, because they soon realize that they do not want to be caught up in this two and three family control of the whole county.

J. Curry: I'd like to talk about the lack of interaction in that superintendent's meeting. I've discovered that working in interaction analysis and interaction skills with teachers in training has been the most productive single thing that we've been able to do. We have been trying to condition teachers to extinguish rejection attitudes from their behavior. Most of us have far more vehicles of rejection than we realize and these go very deep, so that acquiring the skill of interaction is difficult and complicated.

A. M. Johnston: There are many things we can do in our universities and colleges and wherever we are, to preach and to exhibit a philosophy of social participation and involvement.

Our legislature in Knoxville is meeting at the moment, with the result that everyone is afraid to do anything that might offend the legislature, because we depend on the legislature for money.

Julia Curry: I'm not working in Appalachia but at the University of Illinois, where we are working with black students and with the problem of all the so-called culturally disadvantaged students; and we approach it on a multi-level basis.

The program is specifically directed toward the high school graduates getting into colleges and universities. We have an expanding program, and presently maintain an enrollment of 350 black students taken on a non-tuition basis, who cannot get ACT places and whose general high school grades are very low. We run them through a series of one hundred and eighty courses: a speech course, an English course, a remedial program, etc., until we bring them up to the level of what we consider acceptable for a college freshman. The program is directed by a black community leader who is on our faculty. Each student is followed carefully; all teachers are aware who they are. If I get a student who is involved in this program, in a lecture, for example, I know that he is in that program; all teachers are instructed to follow that student's progress carefully.

In our Teacher Education program our work is a little different in that it has been involved in language. The Bernstein studies, the McDavid group studies at the University of Chicago, have formed the basis for our philosophies about the teaching of English as a second dialect or a second language. We have spent a good deal of time working with video tapes in the black community, taping children's language and evaluating it in terms of grammatical structure. And we are asking such questions as: why don't the students perform well? Why in the fourth grade can't they read the fourth grade white texts? We find that many of the public school teachers (and I would guess that this might be true in Appalachia) are suffering from the opinion that because the students don't perform well, because they can't communicate, they are a little mentally retarded group. I can sympathize with the teacher, as I see this happening in a black community anyway: she doesn't understand the language of that student; she doesn't understand that the way in which he talks at home is perfectly acceptable at home; she doesn't understand that what we need to do as teachers is to encourage him to use that home talk at home, and to teach him to operate in a world where he needs a second language.

Professor Beverly Lusty's NDEA Institute this summer was very interesting in evaluating teachers' opinions of their students. They came to understand so much better what that student was like when he was communicating with someone who was an outsider to his own social group--the fact that he could talk around you and you would have no idea what he was saying.

When a middle class teacher goes into a lower class community in Appalachia, she does not indeed understand his language. So now in our Teacher Education Program, we spend a good deal of time studying English as a second dialect, and lower class community dialects, black or otherwise, so that that teacher has a good working knowledge with which to understand the student's use of language and his reading problems.

B. Franks: When you take the kids who are only marginally competent in some areas and put them through the remedial courses, are you training them to be good middle class adults, or are you training them to be social revolutionaries?

Julia Curry: I think we're getting a little of both and I don't know that you can separate those two classes always. In addition to classroom time, we have weekly small-group discussions, conducted by black discussion leaders, where we discuss social problems and the student's problems with other students.

We are also interested in the effect of the sensitivity group at the University of Illinois. We had the sensitivity sessions in what is called a micro lab because getting black students to explore their feelings is a much more complex problem than we had ever realized. They simply cannot interact on that basis; they withdraw. In a sensitivity group, something so simple as holding hands with your eyes closed; it's a strange experience in that you realize that you reject some people and some people are rejecting you. You don't know why you want to hold somebody's hand more than another person's hand, but at least there is value in experiencing it. The black students can't work at this level with whites. They do not relate: they're afraid and the whites are afraid, and both groups reject each other. Some of these people have come up with some interesting thoughts about why they can and can't react and why they're afraid to fit in.

So I don't know whether we're turning out revolutionary people. They're certainly not going to be our present concept of middle class whites. Criticism, as a matter of fact, comes from the present middle class group.

P. Burns: I would like to talk about the power structure again. The local boards and local superintendents are the only people now being reinforced and rewarded for their behavior. It is difficult to know what would motivate them to change. Certainly, we can't just stand up and say, "Now this is your problem, this is the way you operate and it's bad." That is too negative an approach; if they were to change their behavior, the response to them would be negative, and they would then revert to their original attitudes.

F. Stallings: This is the problem in Appalachia, now. A few years ago, I was in a meeting with Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, and someone raised this very question. The people with power have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo because it has rewarded them to do so and has put them where they are; and they are not going to give this position up easily. Margaret Mead was asked the question, "How do you overcome vested interests?" Her first comment was, "There is no other kind of interest."

This is quite true, and perhaps we should see some hope in the fact that these people have come to see themselves and their status depending upon this power, and are therefore in a certain frame of reference. Most of these people, though, have other frames of reference, as well. They are parents with children in the schools usually, and they are often members of a church. Margaret Mead's idea is that when you approach people of power, recognizing them in the role of being in the power structure, you're reinforcing it; but when you appeal to them from other points of view -- as a religious man, as a parent with children in school -- then you can persuade them that you are interested in the survival of the community. You want the best education for your children and you're not going to have the best education for your children until you do something about other children.

Survival of the community is probably what they feel strongest about. They struggle to keep people in the community, because their power depends upon the subservience of others. People are leaving Appalachia. If somehow we can convince the power structure that change is needed, this great exodus might not take place. Also we must persuade the people, the teachers, who are docile and who accept this kind of paternalism to begin to question it and to begin to assert themselves.

A few years ago, as a member of our educational ethical practice group, I received a complaint from a teacher who said that she was being psychologically mishandled by the superintendent in a rural school system. She included in her letter a map of the county school district with a mark where each school was located, and a genealogy. Every teacher in that school system was related by immediate kinship or by marriage to the superintendent. And this is how the paternalistic control network works there. Almost every teacher there had been to some state institution or some institution of higher learning for education, but they had come back in subservient, accepting roles.

And I feel sure that the students who came to my institution probably received no inspiration to work for justice and for progress. Most of the students that left our institution, left with docile, accepting attitudes. They exhibited no militancy at all.

B. Franks: Within the framework of our institution, we reinforce this docility because we never ask students about the program and the curriculum; and the rewards that the students receive are based upon the grades that we give them. In order to go on to graduate school, for example, you need a certain average, which means that students are not going to risk their grades for the sake of expressing their opinions.

Zi Graves: But the most significant factor affecting student behavior in Appalachia is the paternalism of the society. A small group of businessmen controls the economy: the company mine, the company store, and the company town. It is the result of the plantation culture, in which the few people who own the plantations direct the whole economy, the whole mores, the whole activity.

Sophia Nelson: Most of the people in Appalachia have been there a long time, whereas in Chicago, you have constant migration, and many factors that would make for disturbance and dissatisfaction. Appalachians are people who love the area and stay there. Even poverty has not driven them away. If they leave, they come back.

Paul Burns: In Tennessee we have the town of Oak Ridge, which was settled almost entirely by people out of state; we brought people from all over the country together into a town. The whole community -- the parents, the citizens -- demand good progressive education and Oak Ridge, which is not typical, has the most progressive system in the state.

Revolution will not happen suddenly, but there are signs of its coming. (There is also a contradiction to this when you consider that the only student reaction that we've had in Appalachia was at Pikeville College, where they had a very progressive and aggressive administration. The students revolted to move to a more conservative and more traditional situation.) The size of the student body, though, is highly significant. At your University in Chicago, the University of Illinois, there are bound to be enough people to exercise leadership and enough people to give support. Also, the traditions of the Chicago community are different. They have had gangsterism; they have had small groups operating militantly; they have had organized crime.

In Appalachia, however, the population feels affection for its traditions and is comfortable with conservatism. A young professor in one of these colleges in Appalachia who is regarded as "way out" is going to be punished; he is going to be crucified.

However, there is always a residue of progress there, and I do think that teachers could become the leaders, because they probably have more education than anybody else. The institutions have missed their opportunity; they are too willing to condone a very passive role. At our institution, for instance, teachers are not encouraged to become involved in the community.

A few years ago I visited an institution in Kentucky and this is the description of the institution that was in the catalog: "We conceive the four years of college as a period where the student withdraws from the world to meditate on the eternal verities of our existence -- Who are we? What is man? What is his destiny? What are the true values of life? -- and that he may go forth later into the world to be of service to mankind." I read this to the president and the dean of this college and I said, "There's an inconsistency here. You've written this in the catalog and on the next page it says, 'We have moved to the trimester system, which means that any student who assiduously applies himself can achieve the goals in two years and eight months.' "

This is where I feel so frustrated. I see a part of the problem and I see part of the answer. I am part of the power structure. I feel inadequate in the strategies of the techniques. How can I utilize what little power I have in conjunction with other people?

Sophia Nelson: One answer is to push for more programs like the Tri-University Project, so that more and more people will be inspired to become active. Also, there are lots of things we can do back home that are not quite so dangerous as we might think. (Lillian Smith says this in her book, Now Is The Time.) We, as teachers need to read more. We don't read enough and we don't always include in our reading the things that will teach us.

Also, I would say we need to use all the persuasive approaches that we talked about earlier on the people in the power structure. They are parents; some of them are teachers; they are professional people; they are religious people. We can use the appeals that make sense to them. I though that was a very important point.

Also, sometimes we should take time to reinforce the good folks. I think we do much too little of this. The VISTA people caught the devil in West Virginia and very few of us spoke up in their defense. Some few good politicians stick their necks out and we stand back and say, "No politicians are any good, I don't trust any of them," and we don't put the money out so that they'll have a chance against those who are supported by the other interests.

On our campuses there are occasionally a few students who speak up; there is occasionally a school newspaper with an editor who has something to say. He may have to be defended from those members of the school boards, whether private or state, that don't believe in the freedom of the press. These are things we can do. We know how to put it so they can understand. We can communicate between the two.

We could make a point of including students on key committees of the college and the university (we do this at West Virginia State but I gather it's not very common), such as curricular development committees and administrative committees, not just student affairs or social committees. At our college, many of the key committees comprise fifty per cent students.

Then, as Appalachians, I think that we need to concentrate some effort on developing self-respect in the same way that black people have to accept blackness and to believe in themselves and respect themselves. Appalachians tend very often to feel ashamed of themselves as Appalachians. They hate that word "hillbilly" as much as some people I know hate the word "nigger," because to them it represents a terrible stereotype which is thrown at them in the newspapers of the big cities where they go to work. We need to build respect for the strength of Appalachia, not just for the folk culture (although that's important and should be included), but also for those community people who have something to contribute that we could bring into the school to show our youngsters that here are Appalachians who are doing worthwhile things.

One of the most important areas relating to self-respect is the matter of standard English as a second dialect. Here there is something more important than teaching all the ramifications of the details of the dialect, even though this, too, is important for research. The teacher needs to change his own attitude toward the child's language. He needs to learn to accept that language, and this includes the repertoire of facial expressions, vocal expressions, everything about which the teacher often subtly communicates distaste. We need to resist the pressure from business so that teachers do not need to worry exclusively about spelling standards. Publishers are at last beginning to realize that textbooks should not represent only upper middle class suburban white America so that we are now able to choose from among the materials that are available, those materials that will allow the child to see himself. This is just as true of rural Appalachia as it is of black youngsters generally. We need to look for the materials that will relate the teaching of reading to oral English, not just to book English.

These things are as vital to this matter of "equalizing, humanizing, and individualizing." There is a tremendous amount we can all do even if it's only to help enlighten those of our friends and our colleagues close to us that we can talk to.

Report of Committee XXXIV

Harry V. Scott

The following report from Committee XXXIV will be divided into three parts: (1) The request for an Appalachian conference made to Committee XXXIV by Paul Olson; (2) The Don Davies' concept of "Clinical School Centers;" and (3) A few suggestions made in the group.

The conference leadership approached Committee XXXIV and suggested that it serve as the nucleus for a conference on education in Appalachia to be attended by personnel from regional colleges, community agencies, and perhaps public schools or other institutions. Immediate planning was begun on the logistics of such a conference (with some attention being given to its objectives as these are reflected in the people who would participate).

As I see it, the group's main focus would be to "identify opportunities to exhibit social reconstruction," as social reconstruction is applied to schools and colleges. Given the purposes of Tri-University, the social reconstruction would necessarily bear on elementary schools and their people. In part, this group, which would probably give itself some name, would serve as a support agency for persons attempting to make changes in elementary education in Appalachia. This charge -- and it was what the conference leadership asked of the group, though the group did not give it all that much attention -- this charge implies that we would identify and support those persons who are responsible for whatever changes we can identify. It is entirely conceivable that this group could serve as a support agency in part by developing some channels of information to large numbers of people in Appalachia.

If this group is to be effective, it must wrestle with a particular problem as it compiles these various opportunities for, and evidences of, action to achieve social reconstruction. The problem with which this group must wrestle is not easily phrased, but it might be phrased somewhat as follows: "What level of involvement can we accept for ourselves as professionals without losing whatever power we now have to effect change?" If this seems like a cowardly question, we must honestly face the fact that we are not entirely free to violate the folkways of Appalachia even as we attempt to bring about change. If any further evidence is needed that this is a relevant question, ask Sue Easterling about her progress in Western Kentucky or ask the Vista workers from West Virginia about their current progress in that state. It seems to me that wrestling with this question, perhaps even drawing up a bill of particulars thought to be valid in various parts of Appalachia, would be an effective focus for such a group.

Turning now to Davies' suggestion for "Clinical School Centers" is turning from the void to the visual. It was not possible to get sustained discussion on this matter in Committee XXXIV, though it is probable that other groups were able to do so. In bitter fact, the attempt of several of us to force this topic on the agenda resulted in a complete breakdown of communication within the group. It is my cynical, personal view that too many members of that group, and probably of other groups, were far more interested in doing what Davies had cautioned us against doing -- identifying and bemoaning the problems rather than suggesting what to do about them.

The "Clinical School Center" concept would seem to be an operational way to implement some suggestions made by various members of Committee XXXIV. One of our suggestions was for instructional materials that reflect not only the Black culture but the Appalachian culture. A "Clinical School Center," as Davies sees it, would have the capacity not only for identifying such materials but for constructing them or farming them out for construction. Should we have a "Clinical School Center" in Charleston, or Knoxville, or elsewhere? It could become "home base" for the group which will grow out of the Appalachian conference. Such a committee or group always needs focal centers to which they can point and in which their ideas can be developed. Lacking this, the groups deteriorate to meet-talk-forget groups of which we have so many.

The need for "the ecumenical movement in education," to which Professor Nelson referred, would seem to be best advanced by a "Clinical School Center" where students, teachers, student teachers, academicians, parents, dropouts and others would be able to work. Looking at a center in the most conservative light, it could be the sort of place where Bruner's idea of "my Tuesday-Thursday madman" could be instituted.

Professor Nelson mentioned that we should find ways to reinforce the good politicians and the people who are generally useful in social reconstruction. She further suggested the bringing to our students of outstanding Appalachians so that children can build pride through identification with these people. Such activities would seem to be reasonable interests of an Appalachia group. Quite clearly again a spot such as a "Clinical School Center" could be an operational way to bring about the reinforcement or the wide-spread dissemination of information on outstanding Appalachians.

I think we need to face quite frankly the need for involvement of certain kinds of businesses and industries in the Appalachian group. "Clinical School Centers" can be collaborative efforts between a given business or industry, a given college or university, and other particular institutions or groups. I think we need to begin to identify our friends, those who are willing to help us with resources, money, and materials for the improvement of our schools. Clearly a major publisher or electronics firm is not going to give widespread, shotgun aid, but such a firm might very well be willing to cooperate in a "Clinical School Center" where it not only can try out products but can capitalize on the institutional public relations. The Job Corps model is what I have in mind here.

Finally, a pair of suggestions from the discussion of Committee XXXIV. I suggested two simple procedures which I have found to change behaviors of teacher candidates. I refer to work in interaction analysis and in the building of interaction skills as ways of changing the "natural" way that teachers respond to their students. We have discovered, for example, that most of our students have infinite patience and ability to discover new ways to reject their students' information or behavior. We have systematically set about attempting to extinguish from our students these "natural" rejection behaviors, and in the place of rejection we have attempted to insert other kinds of behaviors. We have been more successful in teaching patterns of interaction that remove teachers from a role in which rejection behaviors seem to appear as if by magic. Quite clearly changing a way that a teacher responds to students is a significant step in restructuring a society more like that which now seems inevitable.

I also mentioned that we have built certain novels and other kinds of books into our teacher education program, at least on a choice basis. I refer of course to such books as 36 Children, Death At An Early Age, How Children Fail, the better known novels on teaching, and the like. We are attempting to bring works of social significance, as this bears on teaching, to the center of our teacher education program. Some of our less sophisticated students have inadvertently told us that some of the books and novels named above were the first books that they ever enjoyed reading in college. There are a good many books on Black culture and life in Appalachia that can be built into teacher education programs in some honest way.

IV. Teachers and Education in a Traditionally Legally Segregated Society: The South

The Southern Regional Council has recently published a study of Southern education based on competent research which shows Southern education to be less integrated and less 'just' now than it was almost 15 years ago when the Brown vs. Board of Education decision declared school desegregation illegal. At the same time, some states in the region have a fairly high percentage of children not in school (40% in at least one state). Moreover, certain rural segments of the South are experiencing a rapid out-migration of rural black and white citizens to southern urban centers such as Houston or northern areas such as Chicago. It is against this background that the function of instruction (and instruction in the art of creating a just society) may be considered. The problems which Southern education faces may not be more egregious than those of other sections of the country, but they are different from (and yet related to) those of other sections.

Committees XXXVII-XLIII were concerned with those who wield power in academia in the Southern part of the United States -- with what they have or have not done in the education of teachers. The Tri-University project (and the Triple T project) have in previous conference reports and in OE proposals described a series of directions in which the education of teachers ought to go.

The committees were invited to discuss what will be required fiscally and administratively to create the programs in Education and the disciplines necessary to the development of competent teachers for all of our children -- whatever the cultural enclave from which they come.

Many of the people on the Southern Urban and Rural Committee were administrators in public school systems or State Departments of Education. The function of this committee was to discuss the logistics of state plans vis-a-vis three problems: (1) The present state of bureaucracies at the federal, state, and local level; (2) the functions of state plans in the development of teachers for early childhood and elementary schools; (3) the employment, in their development, of insights derived from agencies which have something to say to states as they seek systems for training teachers: business (Boyd); Centers for Inner City studies (and like agencies, Smith); Centers for the Study of Cognition and Instruction (Bruner); and Centers for studying the relationship between human learning and human social (or economic) behavior (Boulding).

A. Report of Committee XLIII

Eveleen Lorton

Questions Considered:

1. What techniques have been used in the South to halt integration?

2. Is community control a step forward or is it a detriment to true integration?

3. Why is the South afraid of Negro talent?

4. What is the role of the university in promoting "honest" integration?

Discussion:

1. & 3. In far too many instances, as schools are being forced to integrate, Negro teachers, principals, etc. find themselves in meaingless "new" positions or in no positions at all -- a waste this nation can ill afford! The truth needs an outlet and facts need careful examination. Because we talk but don't hear, perhaps emphasis needs to be given to the planning and implementation of worthy dialogical encounters wherein principals, teachers, and supervisors, black and white, are allowed to search for their best selves, explore their feelings for themselves and for others, and gain greater levels of understanding and compassion for others. It is possible!

Teacher-educators, principals, supervisors and other administrators should be required on a regular basis to return to the classroom to work with and study concerns of children. The results of such requirements would be tremendously exciting.

2. Community control, at this time, represents a bewildering phenomenon. In a sense, has not such organization been harmful to integration? If integration truly existed, community control may have positive results; however, community involvement is a richer goal to pursue at this time. Parents should definitely be given the opportunity and encouragement to help in the planning of the education of their children in their own communities.

4. Desegregation Workshops have had positive effects in many areas in the South. School systems should encourage the utilization of the Desegregation Centers. Workshops, conferences, etc. would be opportunities to display and demonstrate materials that are multiracial in nature thus acquainting teachers with availability of a wide range of such materials.

* * *

Report of Committees XXXVIII & XXXIX

Earl Rand

1. A properly conceived and executed program of teacher education in the South must accept the responsibility for modifying teacher responses and behaviors from those which characterize an educated lay citizen to those appropriate for a professional teacher. This is what teacher education is all about.

2. Clearly teacher education has not in the past accepted the responsibility either for defining and describing the proper behavior of a clinically oriented professional teacher or for making fundamental changes in the teacher towards this kind of behavior.

If this New Orleans (1969) Conference has demonstrated anything, it is that teachers are inadequately prepared to provide an education "for all our children." The backgrounds and behaviors of the citizen simply are inadequate whatever the "enclave" in which the teacher is to serve.

Modifying the behavior of the teacher is not a simple task. Many of the responses and reactions which are learned in the general culture are not merely inadequate; they stand in the way of effective teaching. The process of teacher education has to accomplish the difficult task of removing folkway-oriented attitudes and behaviors and replacing them with a professionally effective repertoire of behaviors.

There is little in present approaches to teacher education that has enough instructional power to accomplish such behavior-modification; whole new systems of teacher education must be designed. To fail to do so is to continue to allow the influence of the general culture to determine teacher behaviors. Thus are perpetuated the problems of the present.

With present knowledge it is possible to redesign teacher education. The directions to be taken are indicated in some of the models now being prepared and in the segments of programs now in use in some institutions.

One of the features which seems certain to dominate new programs is a switch from reliance on the lecture to widespread use of "laboratory approaches" with behavior-modification as the central concern (micro-teaching; interaction-analysis; the study of interpersonal relations). Another feature will be the study of cultures and sub-cultures, direct experience with them, and laboratory opportunities for examining responses to experiences with various cultures and sub-cultures.

We are not here concerned with spelling out the details of programs. We are concerned with the need to inspire commitment and a sense of urgency.

3. As colleges, universities, and other organizations and agencies concern themselves with improved teacher education, the first realization will be that those responsible for teacher education programs are themselves unprepared and inadequate to perform the task. All of the limitations now evident in teachers also are present in professors.

Thus, an inescapable conclusion is that there must be an early emphasis on faculty redevelopment. Financial resources to do this must be made available and leadership in it has to be provided.

There are many means by which faculties, supervisors, and staff can be assisted in the processes of personal and collective retooling once the need for it is established and the impetus has been provided. In-service, in-house programs can be developed. Sabbatical leaves can be provided. Special study can be encouraged. Setting up development projects provides staff with opportunities to study, plan, and execute; this process has a strong personal redevelopment spin-off.

The Tri-University Project iself is an example of one form of faculty development. It should be continued and expanded in scope and magnitude. Other emphases should be included in addition to the content field approach. A center might have the development-of-learning-systems as its focus.

When the U.S.O.E. funds institutions under its "Models Project," these institutions should have a central concern as do Tri-University institutions (English, Math, Science, Social Science).

4. It is not enough to redevelop teacher education on the campus. Efforts to re-educate teachers already in service will have to be made.

This is apparent for at least three reasons:

a) We know that we have to prepare the field for the new product of teacher education. An inhospitable field, or one in which new teachers are given no support or encouragement, will tend to destroy new approaches to teaching, and the idealism of new teachers.

b) We cannot afford to wait for the retirement of teachers already in service before more adequate teachers can enter their positions. Both the needs of society and the individual teacher are served by making the service of the teacher as effective and rewarding as possible.

c) The training process requires effective collaborative efforts among teacher preparation institutions, the agencies formally involved with educating people, and the powerful agencies of informal education. Efforts to develop effective pre-service and in-service education should both draw on the same insights, approaches, and resources and go hand in hand.

5. Education responds to community expectations and to the demands of society. Significant progressive changes in education tend to surprise and run counter to the expectations of the citizens who do not always understand the value of new developments. Education has a hard time moving beyond its patrons. Thus effective means of community involvement in education are crucial to the process of revamping teacher education.

6. With respect to the efforts needed to improve teacher education, the following are offered as examples:

a) There is need for strong statements on teacher education through an organization having prestige and an ability to influence policy. Perhaps coordinated efforts and joint statements would be even better. The American Association of Colleges and Universities, the A. C. E., the N. E. A., and others might be considered as agencies which might usefully issue such statements. Such statements might provide impetus where action is lacking, leverage and support where action is being impeded. The time for such an effort seems ripe.

b) An effort should be made to bring together the high-level decision makers of colleges and universities for the purpose of acquainting them with the existing situation, with the recent developments in teacher education, and with the need for action. Again this has the potential of generating interest and commitment where it now is lacking and of lending support to those who are striving to develop better programs. Such a gathering could be at the call of the government (U.S.O.E.) or as part of the program of national organizations or as a foundation-supported effort. Each would have merit.

The program of such a meeting should rely on demonstration and analysis rather than exhortation.

c) There is need for an increase in the number and sources of special funds for development purposes. The development of the conceptualizations of systems and the testing of components of such systems has proceeded so rapidly, and dissemination has been so effective, that many institutions are "ready to go." But the resources needed for developmental and experimental programs are extremely limited. A high and dangerous level of frustration is developing as a consequence. Further, an inordinate proportion of time and energy is being spent in fruitless efforts to obtain resources. Sufficient funds to finance a higher proportion of the proposed projects seems to be a dire need.

d) Though cost levels are not yet clear, it is apparent that an adequate teacher education program cannot be achieved with the present levels of funding. Efforts should be made in all states to gain support for raising support to the level necessary for doing the job. We are reminded of the fact that medical education is financed at a level ten times that of education.

V. Teachers, Educators and Education in the West

Committees XXXV & L

Committee XXXV was concerned with those who wield power in academia in the Western part of the United States -- with what they have or have not done in the education of teachers. The membership of this committee included a chairman of a department of English, a dean of a school of humanities and fine arts, four deans of schools of education, two deans of arts and science colleges, a consultant to the Office of Education, and a variety of people occupying other roles in the educational process. Its primary concern was with the credentialling system in the West.

Committee L was concerned with education in the urban areas in the West. The National Alliance of Businessmen of which Mr. Boyd is a part, Mr. Gardner's Urban Coalition, HUD representatives and HEW representatives have all testified to the necessity for rapid -- almost instantaneous -- improvement in the quality of urban education. The Oceanhill-Brownsville conflict suggests another dimension of the need, as does Mr. Howe's recent speech in support of the movement for community control of education in the large urban centers. Yet, investigations connected with the Kerner report and with the Coleman report suggest that very few programs for the education of teachers exist which really prepare people for the white ghetto or the black one or for doing a job of education in the context of modern civilization generally.

It will be recalled that education in the West faces certain unique problems:

1. The most rapid in-migration and urbanization of any section of the country.

2. A large Spanish-speaking, Spanish-surname community whose cultural traditions connect it to Mexico and ultimately Spain.

3. A large American Indian population with unique historical, linguistic and cultural traditions.

4. An explosive situation in the black community particularly in the Oakland area but also in other areas.

Committee L tried to face these problems. The reports of the committees follow.

Report of Committee XXXV

Administrative: West

R. W. Lid

Committee XXXV (Administrative: West) took as its point of departure for its first discussion session Donald Smith's speech: "The Street Is The Community School." We found Don Smith's speech impressive, both rhetorically and substantively. Indeed we had joined in the standing ovation that he received at the conclusion of his talk. Yet, for all the rhetorical force and substance and even the seeming timeliness of what we heard, we found ourselves curiously unaffected by it -- in part, we decided, because the force of his remarks was directed at other institutions than those we were directly connected with; in part, and this is the more important reason, because all of us, we found upon sharing experiences that morning, had been directly involved in campus confrontations, in student and community protests and demonstrations, both violent and non-violent, and in meeting minority "demands," in planning Black and Mexican-American Studies programs and departments, and in recruiting (and raiding other institutions for) Black faculty. None of us was the innocent he had been at the start of the academic year 1968-69. If Don Smith had spoken in September of 1968, the effect of his speech on us both personally and as educators might have been far more dramatic. Campus events and encounters with student dissidents and minority groups have occurred at such a pace up and down the West Coast that in effect we seem to be, at least psychologically, in the same speed zone and driving parallel with Mr. Smith on the freeway of educational change.

The dittoed sheet handed us at the beginning of our session by the conference planners said that "Committee XXXV is concerned with those who wield power in academia in the western part of the United States -- with what they have or have not done in the education of teachers." While we took the suggestion of much power among ourselves rather lightly, we found our involvement in wider campus activities dealing with educational change indicative of the roles we might shortly find ourselves in if campus unrest is turned toward schools and departments of education and toward the patterns of teacher-training which now exist at most of our institutions. That is, we believe that something similar to the general campus phenomenon of unrest may within a relatively short period of time occur within the various areas of teacher-education in Higher Education institutions. In part, we were astonished at how little unrest of this kind there has been by and large thus far.

The conference planners had asked us "to discuss what will be required fiscally and administratively to create the programs in education and the disciplines necessary to the development of competent teachers for all our children -- whatever the cultural enclave from which they come." They asked us to set priorities where we could and also to indicate, where we could, how we planned to meet them. By and large the focus of our discussions was somewhat more broad than the conference planners had perhaps hoped for. In part because of the nature of the speeches given, we focused in general on cultural pluralism and its effects on teacher-training and teacher-training institutions. We did, however, try to set some priorities, as we saw them.

We took as a given fact that we live in a highly certificated society, and that professional education is among the areas most harrassed and dominated by certification -- by rules, regulations, and criteria largely determined by a vision of society no longer in touch with the realities of a large segment of the public schools and the communities they serve. As one participant put it, drawing upon a basic analogy which occurred more than once in our talks, we and others like us have, as educators, been acting like doctors healing only well patients.

Certification by and for itself, we concluded, is stultifying, and, in the case of teacher education, it is to a large extent a measure of our society's unresponsiveness to change. It was our conclusion that cultural pluralism in education must ultimately lead to a pluralism in certification -- and that something like this is necessary for massive change to occur in the training of teachers. It was our consensus that there is no sacred route to competency, and that many of our ideas concerning certification -- who we are to certify, what we are to certify, how we are to certify -- will have to undergo profound change. For this reason we put as our first priority the need for performance criteria which would distinguish the various competencies necessary to the running of a public school, whether an elementary or a secondary school. To parallel the certification issue for a moment with what we see happening in general on the college and university level, it could be said that the "crunch" Mr. Boulding spoke of is in this case between the desires of a new clientele, with new goals, and the university as a system over grading and certificating and the degrees issued which indicate certification and competency. If the demands for what we could call "input" have changed, what we are witnessing is a reluctance on the part of the university and college (and, one might add, Schools of Education and State Departments of Education) to make any change in the way "output" is viewed. Put in other terms, certification of every kind is now under great stress and the universities and colleges are going to have to view the exciting process from the institution in a different light from the way in which they have viewed it in the past. So too, we feel, are Schools of Education.

We wish to stress that we see the evolution and development of meaningful performance criteria as a way of driving to the root problems of lower education and the pluralism which now seems mandated for the schools. We think a redefinition of functions and goals is necessary not merely for the teacher but for those who would assist the teacher in community services and in making the school not merely in a neighborhood but genuinely of a neighborhood. One might underscore the above by pointing to Don L. Lee's poem "Education," in his volume Think Black! The speaker of Lee's poem comments on the effect his teacher has had on him, cataloging what he has been taught. One stanza runs:

My teacher taught me other things too,
Things that I will be forever looking at;
    how to berate,
            segregate,
            and how to be inferior without hate.

He concludes:

All these acts take as facts,
The mistake was made in teaching me
How not to be BLACK.

We believe we are right in the priority we have set on performance criteria for the new and various competencies we see called for.

In talking things over in subsequent discussions, we discovered all of us were engaged in special teacher-training programs of one kind or another -- The Tri-University Project, Triple-T, the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, and special joint ventures with public school systems on the West Coast. One of our major concerns, we found, was that such programs deal with relatively small numbers of future or experienced teachers. That is, we worried over the question of how to have a mass effect on teacher training and retraining. Most of our institutions, we discovered, are training around 1500 teachers a year. Innovative programs in each institution are affecting at best several hundred future or experienced teachers. Even with Mr. Boulding's help, we found the fiscal issue a trying one, since most of our programs cost three to five times what a "regular" program in teacher education costs. Similarly we found the "in-service training" question a vexing issue, since the consensus was that it is as important to affect the teacher already teaching as to affect the new teacher -- for various reasons. Among them is the often neglected reason that the teacher-in-the-system has a profound effect on the new teacher. As things now stand, the rites of passage by which a new teacher enters the public school system in part stultify and negate whatever the teacher training institution has done in the way of producing a new breed of teacher. One of our major conclusions, and hence our second priority, was that higher institutions of education must break down the barrier between themselves and the public schools and share more fully the in-service domain which by and large has remained the prerogative of the public schools. We think this might be brought about in part by having advisory community boards to schools of education, as well as to the public schools. That is, we believe that a thrust from the community at both kinds of institutions of education might produce a responsiveness to change and cooperation which a thrust at one or the other of the two will not have. The voice of one man shouting in an open field will carry only a certain distance. When he is joined by a second voice, the distance the sound travels is more than double the distance of the voices of the two men individually.

Finally, we responded to Professor Bruner's concern over the New Romanticism he sees on the educational scene -- the self-conscious subjectivity which is apt to put heart over head and hand, to use his terms. Professor Bruner concluded that a key problem for the schools in the future will be to maintain a relationship between heart-head-hand; yet he, like our committee, clearly saw the worth of the New Romanticism -- with its infusion of soul, heart, gut into education. And in the speeches at New Orleans by and large we heard echoes and re-echoes of this romanticism in the attempt to change attitudes -- our attitudes! Not all romanticism, as we know historically, has been bad, though much of it has been. We can only hope that our new brand of romanticism will ultimately lead to a new enlightenment.

* * *

Committee L
The Urban West

James L. Hills

The committee suggests nothing short of a massive attack on the total community school problem through simultaneous inputs from the total resources of the university. This would involve, on the universities' part, a complete educational involvement in school programs from pre-school through adult and vocational education. There should be simultaneous personnel involvement from the various schools of the university -- social work, sociology, delinquency control institute, nursing, recreation, home economics, business, health education, etc. -- with a unit composed of a high school, its feeder junior high schools and elementary schools feeding the junior high schools.

Simultaneously, a model teacher's college program should be started, to update teacher training, both pre-service and in-service, by providing academicians from the disciplines who are concerned with education. A suggested innovation in such a school would be the institution of flexible patterns of credit and units -- for instance, granting ten units of credit for a series of special studies focused on improvement of instruction in the community setting. This would be one way of upgrading teacher preparation by providing relevant experience in community schools. We further suggest an extended term of teacher preparation, to be continued in an on-the-job setting but with course work appropriate to the level of competency of the teachers.

This program would be a joint undertaking with the individual school district. The district would be expected to provide "combat pay" for teachers committed to continuing in the community setting. There would also be necessary the massive support of the schools involved in providing a number of counselors, school social workers, cultural anthropologists, people who can visit homes to communicate with parents, good psychologists, educational planners for curriculum development and resource people to educate the teacher about community affairs.

The teacher's role should be re-defined to include participation in home visits, participation in group seminars involving such personnel as counselors, social workers, and anthropologists as well as resource people. (Release time should be provided for meeting these expectations within the normal daily schedule.) Furthermore, there should be a liaison with the university which includes arrangements for requiring selected teachers to take specified course work to upgrade their skills, as necessary.

This program should be focused on community needs growing out of a definition of these needs by students, parents, school personnel and the university. Thus, the program could be adapted to meet the needs of various groups of the sub-cultures, such as the Chicanos, the Pachos, and the Barrio youngsters, who have different needs although they are all within the Spanish-speaking community.

The community's involvement in this program would include community people actually working in the schools. Many of them might move in a career ladder program from room workers, to office workers, to playground supervisors, to teachers' aides, to teaching assistants and finally to teachers. With some necessary modifications, this is envisioned as an alternate route to certification, through experience. Conceivably, it is a longer route than college programs. The program could be tailored to individual needs, and could be self-pacing if behavioral objectives are set up which clearly define competencies required with levels of preferment stated.

Some community agencies would be involved in the program in terms of bringing these agencies into cooperative relationship with the schools. Where this sort of cooperation is not attained, the juvenile department and the schools are often at odds with each other, the church and the school are at odds with each other, the extended family is at odds with the values presented at the school. "They can undo in two minutes what is the result of days of hard work in the classroom."

191- 194

VI. The City and the Education of Teachers

The education of teachers in the northern cities of the United States faces certain unique problems:

1. The inadequacy of state Higher Education systems for educating teachers in many Eastern states.

2. The failure of many Eastern and Northern states to do a decent job of educating teachers for urban centers.

3. The rapid depopulation of certain rural areas and the consequent difficulty which such "ghettoized" areas have in securing competent teachers.

4. The difficulties and misfittage created by the conflict between the teacher-union movement and the community-school movement.

Committee XLVI discussed these problems.

A. Committee XLVI
The Urban North

Juanita Fletcher

The greatest problem in the education of teachers for the urban centers is the inadequacy of the Higher Education system. This stems largely from the fact that college professors generally are not prepared as yet to see the Black man as a human being. To the professors, the problems of the ghetto are remote. Their exposure to the inner city frequently amounts to no more than voyeurism, that is, going in on some sort of tour, looking around then going out without really being exposed to the problems. Other reasons for the inadequacy of the university are that professors are selected because of advanced work, not on the basis of relevancy; and academic faculties are not willing to adapt to change.

There are several possible avenues for change in Higher Education. First of all we should explore what the professor is and what he does. What are the conditions which lead to his ignorance of the black man's situation? Part of the problem is in the training of the professors. Traditional training seems inadequate to the problems of the inner city; one cannot throw it out entirely, but some sort of modification is needed. The satisfied white middle class community needs to have some sort of orientation to the needs of the inner city, because from this middle-class community will come the college professors of tomorrow. It should be recognized that there is educational deprivation in the white community as well as in the other communities. Lowering the standards of selection of professors is not the answer -- a change in the standard is what is needed. As a first step towards their re-education, the academic faculty should be permitted and encouraged to participate actively in programs in the inner city schools.

Certain basic attitudinal changes on the part of trainers of teachers are essential. First, they should recognize the fact that teachers are not essentially different from children: the same irrelevancy which exists in the education of children, exists in the education of teachers. Many of the teachers operate in fear and insecurity; departure from lesson plans results in teacher panic. Part of the solution to this would be for the trainers of teachers to approach the trainees as human beings -- to allow them more freedom of expression, and to respond to them as people. Furthermore, an upgrading of the teachers' academic background is needed. Defective backgrounds are reflected in poor teaching. The schools should be ready to admit that they often do not have competent teachers and should examine the standards for selection of personnel and the possibilities for the use of other standards (such as leadership, creativity, etc).

School recruitment policies in general are in need of re-evaluation Teachers traditionally come from an upward mobile group and do not want to rock the boat. One solution to this problem would be a desperate search for rebel talent, for people who are willing to rock the boat whenever necessary. Furthermore, there should be recruitment of people from fields other than education, in order to broaden the range of backgrounds of teachers.

The existing remedial programs, which are usually geared to the needs and desires of the white community, should be re-examined. Is reading really necessary? Attitudinal changes may be more important than the acquisitions of skills.

Change can take place within the present system, with the same faculties still present, if educational systems blaze a trail for other social systems by making changes and deploying otherwise productive personnel, who are not succeeding as teachers, to other functions. There should also be a recognition that trainers of teachers are generally not preparing teachers to treat black children as human beings, and an attempt to rectify this.

There is a general air of mutual distrust on the part of the community and the professional educators. Recent studies have shown that the community feels that professional educators often do not know what they are doing, and there exists in Boards of Education a strong disrespect for the professional educator. The reasons for this are that teachers, or any sort of professional educators, are rarely members of school boards and that the boards view themselves as the protectors of the community against the educators. Teachers, on the other hand, are prepared to work with children but not with the adults on the boards; and teachers tend to accept regulations and to hide behind them.

Several other problems exist. The disturbed child, for instance, is frequently unreal to the teacher; he is simply not mentioned. Such problems as drugs, etc., are ignored. The black separatist movement is another problem which may lead to greater or lesser harmony, depending upon the reactions of the professional educators to it. Dialogue should be conducted on possibility of a bifurcated system of training teachers for specific types of communities, and on the role of the black militant as related to the decentralized school system.

B. Note on Action --

Sister Mary Constantine

My own elementary training in a bilingual-bicultural educational institution, my experience in teaching bilingual-bicultural children, and especially my convictions in regard to this area urge me to become involved in setting up a clinical school in my institution, according to the objectives of Tri-U's, "to do research concerning education, research which informs policy in the immediate school. The teacher-in-training, working with a clinical professor, should learn to work where education is difficult and with a range of cultures and neighborhoods. Professors in the disciplines and in Education should get into clinical schools in areas removed from middle class suburban norms -- to teach there."

I have drafted a proposal for a bicultural-bilingual teacher-training program at my home institution. This proposal includes plans for abiding by the resolutions presented to the Tri-University Conference in Minneapolis by the "community experts" who urged that Office of Education funds should be directed toward the problems of racism and ethnocentricism in education rather than in "studying the poor, the alienated, the powerless of this country." Plans are also being made to incorporate consultation with community groups, since these know the real problems of bicultural-bilingual groups of children. Teachers involved in this program will visit the centers to study the problems and educational possibilities and mutually arrive at satisfactory solutions.

An interdisciplinary program, jointly mounted by Education, Psychology, and Sociology, for an in-service teacher training program seems to be the logical means of creating that flame which "will renew the face of the earth" -- or at least a small part of it, in Chicago.

VII. The Mother Tongue and the Education of the Teacher

A. "Report of Committee IV: Literature," Gil Gravelle, Boulder Junction, Wisconsin

B. "Report of Committee I: Literature," William Anderson, San Fernando State Valley

C. "Creating a Composition," Geoffrey Summerfield, University of York, England. University of Nebraska, Tri-University staff.

VII. The Mother Tongue and the Education of the Teacher

These committees were composed of people who work in the areas of Speech, Reading, English Education, the Language Arts, and Psycholinguistics. Recent studies in linguistics and psycholinguistics suggest that we ought to take a new and radically different look at the functions of and procedures for instruction offered to children in such areas as "Reading," "Speech," and "English." Do these studies suggest radical departures? If so, departures in what direction?

199–201

A. Report of Committee IV

Gil Gravelle

The committee spent most of its time upon the question, "How can English departments do a better job of educating teachers who understand literature and literature for children?" Ned Hedges of the University of Nebraska was invited in to describe a course he teaches, within the English department, for elementary teachers.

"If literary criticism is relevant, it should be relevant in elementary schools," Hedges stated. His goal would be to give teachers some critical tools, some sense of how to guide children's discussions, some beginning kind of critical perception. Structural insights are, he felt, most convenient and most accessible to these people, thus his course consists partly of looking at literature to identify some structures and conventions: certain kinds of plots and certain kinds of heroes, for example.

Norrine Odland asked if this would be a course "fit only for elementary people?" Hedges pointed out that similar courses are offered by the same department for people in other fields.

Further committee discussion mostly involved Hedges' proposal. The committee as a whole was reluctant to recommend such a course because of the danger of searching for literary conventions to the exclusion of other aspects of literature felt to be more important or more basic. Earlier, Gene Slaughter had felt that some work in literary criticism might be useful for teacher candidates who already had enough background in literature to make such work valid. He thought, too, that Hedges was describing some of the games you can play in literature, that kids can discover these games and develop a sense of form through playing them themselves, discovering models of language. Norrine Odland wondered if English department offerings are not too often keyed to the needs of English majors.

There seemed to be some feeling in the committee, then, that some improvements were possible in English department offerings to elementary teachers, but no real consensus was reached as to just what they would be.

Speaking from a few years' experience with elementary teachers and with kids, using some of the ideas Ned Hedges proposed, it seems to me that his proposal has more validity than it was felt by the committee

as a whole to have. For one thing -- and this is the perhaps overly pragmatic viewpoint of one who is primarily a classroom teacher -- it works. Secondly, it seems to me that kids -- and thus their teachers -- need some sort of handle to get hold of literature by, and Ned's handle is one they can reach. I do not see that possible criticisms of details of the Nebraska Curriculum Materials or their application invalidate this. The elementary teachers and students I meet have no hold on literature as a subject, they have a handful of beads with nothing on which to string them. And if teachers have no such vision of literature, how can they free themselves from texts or be selective and flexible in the use of curriculum materials as we expect and hope them to be, or how can they develop such a vision in their students?

B. Report of Committee on Literature: Committee I

William Anderson

The Literature I committee was composed of elementary teachers and college professors of English and Education who specialize in literary criticism and children's literature. The group raised questions concerning the role of literary analysis in the training and functioning of the elementary teacher. The discussion brought up three interrelated problems, and a summary of each is presented below.

I. What training in literary analysis should occur in the college preparation of the elementary teacher?

The analysis of literature is practiced in diverse ways by a multitude of critics and teachers, and the "methods" of proceeding in this activity are numerous. Common to all, however, is the assumption that beneath the apparent surface of the literary work is a further meaning, greater than the composite of the parts, but which is nonetheless constructed of observable elements which can be named and described. The value of the nomenclature of literary criticism is that one can thus speak in specific, meaningful terms, establishing a currency of communication. Even among the professionals of the committee it was necessary to discard such words as "fineness" or "sensitivity" or "quality": instead, we found more tangible terms such as "skill," "technique," or, more particularly, "archetype," "convention," "plot structure," etc., of greater value in giving expression to our feelings about various works of literature. In discussing literature, it is necessary to reach the level of feeling through the channels of the reason. To do this, analysis and description of parts proved of great importance.

As we thought of our own backgrounds and studies, and what we had ourselves found helpful as teachers and students of literature, and even as group participants in talking about our ideas, we returned again and again to the point that the true liberation of the teacher to find the best literature for his class, and the ability to present it in the best way, depends upon an awareness of the processes of literary analysis, its techniques, its terms, and its practice.

English departments are usually responsible for training persons in literary analysis, and it is here that the prospective elementary teacher might receive his training in the analysis of literature. Numerous studies (Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers, Landau-NCTE Teaching Children's Literature in Colleges and Universities, Anderson in A Pride of Lions) indicate, however, that elementary teachers infrequently, if scarcely ever, receive such training. In fact, the training in English which an elementary teacher receives is almost always limited to the introductory courses in composition, taught usually by persons without Ph. D. 's in English. There are several states (California, Texas, and New York) which require more work in English, and these programs could provide models for other states. The committee agreed that only through a study of practical literary analysis can the understandings, awarenesses, and perceptions necessary to discussing or teaching literature be developed.

II. What direct applications of literary analysis can be made to children's literature?

A prevalent myth is that literary analysis is not applicable to children's literature. This misconception both of literature and analysis is evident both in English and Education departments. And this false notion can be blamed for much of what is wrong with Language Arts programs in the elementary schools.

English departments do not offer children's literature as a part of their curriculum, clearly considering it somehow beneath the seriousness of their endeavors, although no other branch of the art, even the film, is too exotic for inclusion in their offerings. And from the evidence of the Landau study, Education departments typically teach the course in children's literature as a bibliography of children's books, with no attention being given to literary explication. Without the necessary skills to understand, to evaluate, and to select newly encountered works, the teacher of literature, thus deprived of such awarenesses, is chained to the most recent, and perhaps spurious, lists of readings for children, and even then he is left with probably little understanding of the depths of what he is teaching.

The Nebraska Curriculum Materials and the Literature report of the 1968 Tri-University Project in Elementary Education, University of Nebraska Center, fully demonstrate that the concepts of literary criticism are fully as applicable to children's literature as to adult literature. The questions of literary analysis and perception are as necessary in discussing children's literature as in any other branch of literature.

Thus, a teacher of literature must know how to discover the inherent meanings in the works he proposes to teach. Every teacher needs to be able to choose for himself works of literature which are relevant to the lives of the students who live with him in his classroom. Now that we all admit the vital nature of literature in shaping and forming the imagination, and thus the intellect, of the child, we can agree that the teacher must be equipped to discover and to present what uniquely or universally is nourishing to Harlem, to Dallas, to Watts, or to Beverly Hills. To quote Bruce Mickleburgh from The Arts of Language, we find a similar plea:

> I have chosen the difficult example of irony to illustrate that the teacher who is a competent critic will know exactly where a given work under study by the children fits into the whole body of literature. He will be able to relate it in his own mind so that he can structure the child's learning experience in accordance with the discipline of literary criticism.
>
> To be strictly accurate, we must state that neither the child nor the teacher can study literature. What is experienced is literature, but what is studied, and what is practiced by the teacher in the classroom, is criticism.

What is needed, then, is a course in literary criticism, closely linked to the study of children's literature, in which the notions, processes, and details of literary criticism are presented to the elementary teacher in such a manner that he sees the family of literature, and that he develops the power of mind to become a critic in his own arena of action.

III. What part can literary criticsm play in presenting literature to children?

The inductive method, so widely and rightly favored, demands an even greater awareness of literary structures on the part of the teacher than the so-called authoritarian approach. In order to devise creative and free stimuli for children, the teacher must have the clearest kind of understanding of the literary work, enabling him to grasp the drifts the talk will take, to push forward with some glimmers from the students and to redirect others. Free play and talk are excellent in their own way, but this is not the teaching of literature. The creative teacher wants to help the students see what he thinks is in the literary work. The experience of talking freely about, not around, literature demands that the teacher feel very secure in his knowing the piece so that the many dimensions, not just the surface, can be explored.

Another pernicious myth is that literary criticism stultifies the performance of the teacher and the child in the classroom. Understanding on the rational and intellectual level does not negate pleasure. And the learning to see the world out there with the help of others who have symbolized their view of that Mystery in literature is what the teacher can do for the child in his search for myth and for identity.

The pleasure of finding a brother on the darkling plain, another who has seen the meaning in silence, is the worth of the study of literature. The teacher who has knowledge is the best guide in the quest; there is no substitute for knowing.

C. "Creating a Composition"

Geoffrey Summerfield
Committee XXIII: Creativity

Composition: Ia: the act or process of composing; *specif.*: arrangement into proper proportion or relation and esp. into artistic form. (*Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*).

This dictionary definition will do for a start, for something to kick off with: what is missing from the definition, however, is crucial for us as teachers of English; I mean: subject matter, referent, content, raw materials, *What is being composed.*

The impulse to compose cannot be separated off from *what* is being composed, nor can it be isolated -- except theoretically in, say, systematic psychology or psychopathology -- from the composer. For composition occurs, in our real lives, at a point of intersection between the inner and the outer, between the self and something operating on, pressing in on, provoking, exciting, intriguing, that self. Richard Wilbur, for example, has told us that his poems get written most often as a response to a sense of calamity, a sense of being threatened, a sense of an impending fragmentation of the order that the self has provisionally constructed out of the flux of experience. So that a poem is, for Wilbur, a means of reassembling the world, of regaining or retrieving a sense of order.

And in such retrieval it is possible to isolate three sequential stages. The sequence begins in consciousness or awareness, a more than usually vivid or urgent or sharp sense of the world, of some particular corner of experience, some crisis or epiphany, some sense of incongruity or of sublime transcendental congruity: depending on the nature, the tone, of the consciousness, the poet may come up with a tragic poem -- like Howard Nemerov's "Death and the Maiden" -- or a comic (as opposed to tragic) poem -- like Denise Levertov's "The Secret."

The second stage is the stage of transfusion, whereby the awareness is brought into the open, is put out there, in words on the page: this is not to suggest that there is a sharp, infrangible, severe distinction, in fact, in consciousness, between the epiphany and its articulation. On the contrary, the sharp momentary awareness may well be, itself, a formulation, an image, a sense of relationship, that itself comes unbidden to consciousness *already* in words, already as language. Nevertheless, the act of making *can* be separated off from the initial insight or perception since it constitutes a stage of activity in which will, intention, volition, control are involved; a stage in which the composer is *making* a representation of the insight, the epiphany. And in this stage the composer is also critic, the two roles engaging in a more or less delicate more or less strenuous interplay, one with another.

The third stage is the one marked by a return from the private to the public world, when the composer returns from the privacy of composing to the publicity of sharing, of showing, of giving, of saying: "This is what my world looks like: let's see what you think of it; let's see what *your* world looks like."

Assuming that for practical purposes, pragmatically, some such crude model of the acts of *Homo Faber* will serve our needs, we need now to ask ourselves a crucial question: assuming that -- our culture being what it is, i.e., less habitually creative than that of the Navaho or of the Benin civilizations -- assuming that children are not encouraged to go much beyond the first stage -- the "ooh!" stage, as a friend recently described it -- beyond, maybe, sharing some epiphany in conversation with a close friend: assuming all this, what, then, is the role of the teacher, whether at Elementary School level or at High School level?

In the first place, it is precisely to believe in the possibility of awareness, the possibility that those kids in those desks *have had* and *are having* vivid, sharp, dramatic, emotionally charged experiences. Such a belief is a fundamental premise in my own thinking about composition; without it, no teaching of English is, in my view, possible or worth bothering with. It is what is most distinctively human about the kids -- their bundle of delights, enquirings, joys, anxieties, sorrows, dreams, fantasies, visions, aspirations, fears -- it is this that we have to *admit* to the classroom. If we don't, then we are deluding ourselves about the meaning of 'education'. How do we so admit such strange creatures as visions, fears, and sorrows -- admit, that is, to the neutered sterile order that characterizes so many of our classrooms? We cannot do it, we never will do it, by hanging up banners which shout BE CREATIVE! BE COMPOSERS!, when our tone of voice tells them that we are sharing that room with them in order to buy the second automobile or the first boat, that their co-presence is the price that we have, alas, to pay in order to keep up with the Johnsons. Difficult -- nay, impossible -- is it not, to like all of the kids that we teach? "Agreed," you cry aloud. So let's try to endure as decently and unhurtfully as possible those few who really get under our skin, or up our nostrils, and maximize and spread out from the more numerous genial and congenial relationships that we *can* create during our first few weeks of a new class.

Let us, above all, at this stage let them know that we also are human beings; let us reminisce, not for too long, about how we coped, how we feared, how we got into trouble, when we were -- incredibly -- nine, or twelve, or sixteen. In conversation, one of the most frequent connectives that helps the conversation to continue is the simple formula "Oh, that reminds me of the time when I. . . ." And much of our conversation is the means whereby we make for and to each other our representations of the world, and do so by *telling stories*. This reciprocal exchange, then, is *the* beginning, of one of the *best* beginnings, for composition, for the simple -- ostensibly simple -- business of working towards a world-picture, characterized both by consensus (we *all* recognize it, to some considerable degree) and by distinctiveness (Pam's 'world' is distinctively different from Karen's 'world' or Kathy's 'world'). Two tactical problems occur quite sharply in such a procedure. The first is writing-shyness: the reticence that poor performers or more accurately, kids with a history of poor performance (i.e. of inadequate motivation), often display.

The second is the unfortunate side-effects of some recent fashions in 'creativity': the notion that 'creative writing' is essentially different from the ways in which we normally talk, think, imagine, represent, and write. One peculiar manifestation of this is the pretty or prettified poem: the product of the child's assumption that one puts on one's poetry voice or one's poetic voice in order to write creatively -- that one leaves behind the *lingua franca* of the playground, of the home, of real life, in order to gain admittance to the hot-house where art is made, where poems, like exotic and short-lived blooms, come into brief full flower. *Real* compositions, properly felt, genuinely felt, compositions are much closer to weeds than to hot-house floribunda, and grow among the garbage, the used-car lots, the discarded 7-Up bottles, the bric-a-brac. (Cf. Whitman's great poem, 'There Was A Child Went Forth':

> There was a child went forth every day.
> And the first object he look'd upon, that object he became.
> And that object became part of him for the day or a certain
> part of the day.
> Or for many years or stretching cycles of years.
>
> The early lilacs became part of this child.
> And grass and white and red morning-glories, and white and
> red clover, and the song of the phoebe-bird,
> And the Third-month lambs and the sow's pink-faint litter,
> and the mare's foal and the cow's calf.
> And the noisy brood of the barnyard or by the mire of the
> pond-side,

And the fish suspending themselves so curiously below there,
and the beautiful curious liquid,
And the water-plants with their graceful flat heads, all
became part of him.

The field-sprouts of Fourth-month and Fifth-month became
part of him,
Winter-grain sprouts and those of the light-yellow corn, and
the esculent roots of the garden,
And the apple-trees cover'd with blossoms and the fruit
afterward, and wood-berries, and the commonest
weeds by the road,
And the old drunkard staggering home from the outhouse of
the tavern whence he had lately risen,
And the schoolmistress that pass'd on her way to the school,
And the friendly boys that pass'd, and the quarrelsome boys,
And the tidy and fresh-cheek'd girls, and the barefoot Negro
boy and girl,
And all the changes of city and country wherever he went.

His own parents, he that had father'd him and she that had
conceiv'd him in her womb and birth'd him,
They gave this child more of themselves than that,
They gave him afterward every day, they became part of him.

The mother at home quietly placing the dishes on the
supper-table,
The mother with mild words, clean her cap and gown,
a wholesome odor falling off her person and clothes
as she walks by,
The father, strong, self-sufficient, manly, anger'd, unjust,
The blow, the quick loud word, the tight bargain, the crafty lure,
The family usages, the language, the company, the furniture,
the yearning and swelling heart,
Affection that will not be gainsay'd, the sense of what is real,
the thought if after all it should prove unreal,
The doubts of day-time and the doubts of night-time, the curious
whether and how,
Whether that which appears so is so, or is it all flashes and
specks?
Men and women crowding fast in the streets, if they are not
flashes and specks what are they?
The streets themselves and the facades of houses, and goods
in the windows,
Vehicles, teams, the heavy-plank'd wharves, the huge crossing
at the ferries,

The village of the highland seen from afar at sunset, the river
        between,
Shadows, aureola and mist, the light falling on roofs and gables
        of white or brown two miles off,
The schooner near by sleepily dropping down the tide, the little
        boat slack-tow'd astern,
The hurrying tumbling waves, quick-broken crests, slapping,
The strata of color'd clouds, the long bar of maroon-tint away
        solitary by itself, the spread of purity it lies motionless in,
The horizon's edge, the flying sea-crow, the fragrance of salt
        marsh and shore mud,
These became part of that child who went forth every day,
        and who now goes, and will always go forth every day.

Notice that the child's inclusive sensibility, like Keats's chameleon sensibility, incorporates not only the lilacs and the lambs, but also the old drunkard and the tight bargain: the kids we teach are more likely to meet the latter than they are to meet the former.)

But look at most recent publications here in the States on the subject of 'creative writing' and you'll see that such writing represents a strategy for misrepresenting, or not-representing-at-all, the world of the child as it is, and substituting for that world a cozy, phoney public-relations image of a world as beautiful and sterile and unreal as the world of most cosmetics ads, where daffodils nod their heads eternally in an eternally-fragrant breeze.

Composition, ideally, represents the student's opportunity for presenting his (her) world *as it is* and as it can be; the modes for such presentation are potentially as various as the pupils, but the central and dominant mode is surely the narrative mode. Listen to any two or three children making representations of their worlds to each other, in conversation, and you will hear argument, persuasion, description, analysis, speculation, and so on: but most of all you will hear anecdotal narrative, e.g. when a child says to another, "Oh, Miss X is a So-and-So," what almost immediately follows on the categorical definition is a recounting of some specific event which will serve to give substance, concreteness, specificity, to the generalization. If therefore, I were asked for a composition programme for students in grades 1 through 12, I would reply: "Don't expect an easy answer. Go away and read. Read James Moffett's *Student-Centered Language-Arts Curriculum, K-12* (Houghton-Mifflin, 1968). Read John Dixon's *Growth Through English* (N.C.T.E.). Read the teachers' Manuals to my recent poetry anthology *VOICES*, (for grades 6 through 12) (Rand McNally, 1969)."

Meanwhile, consider these 'stories', written by sixth grade students: written as a result of particular invitations or challenges which were tempered by the teacher's knowledge of the students in question. I would merely add that they were *not* written as a by-product of working through text-books or course books or structured programmes or any other such mode of dehumanization and alienation as most publishers are still inflicting on us; they were written, rather, by kids who feel accepted and acceptable, who can be honest, tolerably honest, about themselves, who have a history, however short, of congenial socially-supported experiences of putting pen to paper and who know that the business of "making things up" is one that is not merely tolerated by the teacher but is enthusiastically and generously encouraged.

Appendix A.

Can you remember when you were so little that you could not reach anything? Well, this just the problem this small boy is having. His name is Johnny. He is very (Mischevious.) Right now he is trying to get a garage door down. I doubt very much that you could get another thing in that garage. It has a carrige for dolls, with a doll in it, a bycicle, a pail, a garbage can, a very large one too, and a thousand other things. I think he had some help getting up there because he is up in the air about three feet, and his feet dangling. Later I found out that the door was stuck. He ask me to get him down, but his hands were cemented on with rubber glue we tried everything. And then he ask me if I used any water sure enough, water worked, and didn't go to the garage for a few days.

Well this about 20 years later and he, Johnny is a remarkable young scientist and is called John. We told him about this story. He laughed. Well next time I'll tell you another story.

Karen

Note to Appendix A.

Karen's prose is distinctively her own: in its rhythms, its rhetorical devices, and in its tone. It is not something derived from a prose-manual or a rhetorical text-book, but is an expression of her own sensibility: notice the way she 'invites' the reader into her prose.

In line 3, the idiosyncrasy of her punctuation is a neat and effective way of achieving emphasis: it may not be *yours* but it *works*, doesn't it?

What does the teacher do by way of response to this? Clearly there's no urgent need for instruction: the omission of 'is' between this and just in line 2 is of no matter, and the spelling of bicycle in line 6 is something that can be left to take care of itself. I'd be inclined to help her with ask and asked, but would have to remember that she doesn't say 'asked' but 'ask.'

(The prose derives from Karen's looking at and 'entering into' a picture.)

Appendix B.

I'm running into a world of happiness through the short green grass, through the beautiful April Breezes right by the tiny eyes of my friends, the grasshoppers, crickets, butterflies and most of all the flowers.

As the sun looks down upon my face, a smile crosses my face. I'm going to continue running until I'm no longer able to run anymore and my dog and I will fall into our world, where joy peeks out among the grass, where Love runs out to meet us, and where happiness shines among us, and nobody else is in this world of ours -- just
My dog
and
Me.   Kathy

Note to Appendix B.

The title of this could be "Ecstacy.' It could have been phoney but it isn't, is it? The large abstractions, "Love" and "Joy" take on genuine meaning, are validated by the event that serves to arouse and sustain them.

Note how the headlong rhythm carries and embodies -- enacts -- Kathy's response to the experience. In this case, Kathy was looking at a picture of a small child and a small dog in a very large field.

Appendix C.

The Bird

One day, I saw a bright colored bird. He was a black shiny bird with a red spot on his wing. He was sitting in a field of corn. He seemed to be talking to other birds all over the field, and waiting for their reply.

I tried to catch him but he flew away. I looked over the field many times, before I found him. When I saw him the last time he was happy and gay, now he had a broken wing. I was very unhappy, so I took the bird in my hand and then took my sweater and made a soft bed for him. I took him home with me. I begged my mother to let me take care of him. She said yes. Three weeks had past I fed him and kept him in a box, he seemed to be getting well. One day, I went to his box he was gone. I looked all over the house and found him in the upstairs bathroom. I then took him in my hand and took him back to the place where I found him and then I went home. When I got there he was sitting his box. So I kept him tell he died seven years later. It is said that you can't tame the wild. But it is possible.

Karen

Note to Appendix C.

This story is the result of a commission: I asked Karen to write a story about a bird for the children in grade one. All I said was 'Remember the children that you're writing for. Keep it simple. The next stages will be for Karen to write out the story in large print, illustrate it, bind it, make a cover, and present it as a book to the grade one children.

Could you have made a better story, at the drop of a hat, in half an hour? What about paragraphing? Should the teacher growl at her "What about paragraphing?" or what?

Appendix D.

Joy

Joy to a child is getting a new toy and sharing it with his best friend. Joy to a teenager is love and peace. Joy to a grownup is having some old friends that they have not seen for a long time. Joy is a wonderful thing if you use it in the right way. Joy is a friend to some people to others it isn't. Joy is seeing flowers come up in the spring, and seeing the trees come alive. Joy is seeing some children playing in the park and dogs running and barking after them. Joy is sitting on the poarch swing and listing to the birds sing in the trees. Joy is driving on a country road on a sunny day. Joy is seeing the rain coming down. Joy is seeing the leaves come down off of the trees.

Pamela

Note to Appendix D.

How would you respond to this? Answers, please, to Geoffrey Summerfield, Tri-University Project, University of Nebraska.

215 - 218

VIII. Schools Where Teachers Can Be Educated

The members of Committee XXV had had special experience in the conduct of "practicum," or practice teaching, situations or in work in a "clinical school" setting. What is meant by a clinical school is quite various. In some cases a clinical school is simply a fancy name for a laboratory school; in others it is becoming a special kind of institution similar in function to a clinical hospital and staffed by clinical professors. Some descriptions of possible clinical schools and formats are contained in Conant's Education of America's Teachers, The Clinical Professorship in Teacher Education, and a variety of other books.

42

Committee XXV:
The Clinical School

The committee discussed a "clinical" situation in which two or more Tri-University Project graduates would relocate in the same school to implement some of the educational innovations suggested by the project. The placement of more than one Tri-University graduate in one place would have two distinct advantages: these teachers could be placed at successive grade levels, establishing a continuity in the progress of the children in the grade school, and the presence of several teachers would provide reinforcement and strength for programs of innovation.

This situation would provide the opportunity to follow up on some of Don Davies' ideas -- the training and use of para-professionals, and training of interns and/or student teachers. The para-professionals involved would be taken directly from the immediate community, and would consist of such people as mothers, veterans, retired craftsmen, high school dropouts, community leaders and others. The primary goal of such a school would not be that of standing as a model, but rather presenting a situation where teachers and ideas would have a chance to initially get off the ground, in the right directions and with the right wings. From this situation, it would be hoped that these teachers and student teachers, interns, etc., would scatter and carry with them an effective program for change.

These clinical schools would ideally be a combined cooperative effort on the part of the local school system, the administration, the community people, and, wherever possible, a college. However, no one of these groups should be allowed to assume complete control. The classrooms must be permitted to retain a significant amount of autonomy and freedom.

The topic of floating clinical teams was discussed, but the committee did not come to any specific ideas as to how this technique could be used effectively. The major problem with this seemed to be an almost complete over-emphasis on the content of courses, which tends to tie a teacher down to one place.

As a final recommendation we suggest that strong regional links should be established and maintained among Tri-U veterans living in near proximity to one another. The clinical school as mentioned above, would serve very nicely as the core or central clearing house in maintaining regional communications, relations and support.